# THE CHURCHMAN.

VOLUME XV.—No. 26. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 754.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK: SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1845. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 161 FULTON-ST. } Terms—$3 00 per annum—in advance.

For the Churchman.

## Lays of Holy Church.

NO. XVI.

### Commission of the Monastic.

Go to the desert, or the solemn wood;
Go where the glacier-crested mountains rise,
And wake the deep heart of the solitude
With psalms and litanies!

Let the sweet bells awake on each wild shore,
By the loud surging of the stormy sea;
The rocky pass; the bleak and desolate moor,
There let your dwelling be.

Fasting and isolation filled the cup
Our Master drank of—shrink not from its brim.
Leave kindred, wealth and honor, and take up
The Cross and follow Him.

Let the blest symbol on your hallowed spires
Glow like a beacon for the pilgrim's eye;
And warm the heart of penury with the fires
Of holy sympathy.

Ne'er let the wretched outcast to your walls
Enter unwelcomed or depart unblessed;
Be balm for sickness ever in your halls,
And for the wanderer rest.

Let ceaseless supplication rise to God;
Let daily bread be at your portals given;
For prayer and almsdeeds smooth the rugged road
That leadeth unto Heaven.

Let not your holiness be outward grace;
Nor, neath the sackcloth raiment, haughty be;
But let your souls be penitence and praise,
Your lives humility.*

Then shall ye smile upon the bed of death—
Satan shall flee discomfited and awed;
And angels, lingering for the parting breath,
Shall bear you unto God! Acolytis.

* "Tonsura et habitus modicum confert; sed mutatio morum et mortificatio passionum faciunt verum religiosum."—*S. Thomas a Kempis, I.* 17.

## Communications.

For the Churchman.

## Solifidianism and the Death-bed.

NO. I.

### What is Solifidianism?

What is meant by Solifidianism? It is that theory which states truly 'that man is saved by faith only,' and then interprets the word 'faith' *falsely* according to its own notions—which takes St. Paul's declaration that 'we are justified by faith without the works of the law' to include not only the works of the Jewish ceremonial law, and the works of mere natural morality 'done before justification,' but also all works of Christian charity and Christian love. It therefore denies altogether or evades the declaration of St. James, 'that a man is justified by works and not by faith only.'

Solifidianism is more than this. It takes the word 'faith,' it narrows and cramps the meaning of it, till it comes to signify a peculiar internal emotion, a sort of feeling excitable in some minds and not in others. And with Solifidians this emotion is held absolutely necessary—it must be in existence or there is no justification.

This is Solifidianism—the notion first, and next the practice upon the notion; for, without both we cannot fully understand what it is. Of course it cuts off and renders secondary, or rather voids all means of grace. No Church, no ministry, no doctrine, no practice, no discipline, no law is necessary to the Solifidian, only the peculiar internal emotion of his own mind. Nature will struggle after and desire these institutions; still Solifidianism goes against them; and because it cannot altogether defeat the yearnings of man's heart after the Church of God and her privileges, it permits a mockery of them to exist under the form of 'voluntary churches,' 'uncommissioned ministers,' 'sacraments without grace,' 'doctrine without consistency,' 'practice upon natural morality,' 'discipline according to the popular will,' and 'law regulated by mere custom.'

We need not look for it. It is the doctrine of Christians without a Church—the doctrine of the sects. Each revivalist is an exemplification of it. He has the power of awakening the 'justifying emotion,' and he has converted so many! His plans are modified and ruled by this persuasion. Like Simon the magician he has 'the great power of God;' and even occasionally he is turned into a mediator between God and man! 'Let any number of names, not more than three at a time (he has not power for more than three!) be handed to Mr. O., and let him pray for them and they will be converted!' Such was the belief, to my own knowledge, of his deluded adherents with respect to a certain revivalist.

We look around for the fruits of Solifidianism and we see them every where around us. In consequence of the opinion that Christianity as a real and stringent law of life has expired, the opinion that it is a rule of action is dead, and the life of professing Christians has become a life based upon natural morality, not founded upon Christ's precepts, but only influenced by them, and that in a far less degree than it is by the popular literature of the day. By it the plain assertion of St. Paul that there are three graces of the Spirit, and that of these charity is the greatest, is denied, and faith is made all in all! By it our Lord's sermon upon the mount has become a moral discourse, very impressive indeed because very metaphorical! The doctrine of holiness and of degrees in it, which men ought by works of love and patience to strive after, is put away. And then, as a result at once and exemplification of the system, listen to the appeals of preachers when it is necessary to arouse their people to any acts of mercy and charity, and see how completely the motives of the Gospel are left out, and how adroitly there are substituted for them the feelings of natural benevolence, of sentimentality, of mere romantic wonder, or still worse, of the party and sect spirit;—how promises are made with a latent condition which ever unties the knot; how possibilities which are most improbable are presented in the most plausible light; how common sense and actual responsibility are avoided by the fiction of a *responsibility to every body, upon paper.* Sir, all these shams, figments and unrealities—they are all the fruits of the great figment of Solifidianism.

How different in its results, both in the present and in past ages is the true Scripture doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as preached by Christ our ever blessed Lord and his holy Apostles, and ever since upheld by His Church; when we look at it, not in the external point of view in which dissenters from their outside position are forced to contemplate it, but in the internal practical view in which we who have been truly born of water and the Spirit, must see it and feel it in connexion with our Lord's Incarnation, in connexion with the Church His Body, the agent and instrument of systematic religion, of spiritual law and spiritual grace! In the one case the two spheres of the Divine and human have but a single point of external contact; in the other all the faculties and feelings of human nature are touched and moulded by the influence of Heaven, as was our humanity by the assumption of it by the Wonder-working Word. The Christian feels himself to be made a member of Christ's body by a union which is miraculous and transcends all human conception, yet is true and real. Dwelling as he does in an 'habitation of clay,' he knows that he is a root of his father's planting, and will yet spring up into the realms of upper day, his proper abode. He knows that by this same means he 'is a child of God,' having the promise and seal of his inheritance even while he dwells among those who have no claim and no right in Christ. He knows that he has an everlasting inheritance to which Christ has assured him; and knowing all this he understands that there is a *law* for him of action and life which it is his duty to obey—a living guide and interpreter of that law, the Church of God;—a fountain, too, of secret and supernatural guidances and graces to which he may ever go, which waits upon him in childhood, leaves him not in manhood, and administers its aids to the death-bed of enfeebled and decrepid age. And the voice of the Church to him ever is a certain voice, it admits of no doubt as to his state and privileges. It says to him, 'Such are your privileges, such your position; here is the law of your life, and here the interpretation; your business then is *to be, to act, to do,* instead of doubting, speculating, feeling and talking.'

Entirely and wholly practical in its influence upon men's life is the Church's doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. But the Solifidian notion is utterly barren, it has no shoots that arise into practical life, no discipline, no practice, no law of action and life peculiarly Christian; and therefore in those that are under it the above results are very plainly seen in life.

But it is at men's entrance upon the profession of Christianity and at their departure from the world chiefly that Solifidianism manifests its fruits of evil. And therefore, at the entrance, many who have been awakened to faith and repentance are suffered to perish, because Solifidianism, as a natural consequence, denies the existence of a Church which has authority from above to guide and control and feed the lambs of Christ's flock. Many, therefore, who would by the authority of a Church have been taught 'to add to their faith works,' to undo by actions the evil they had done, who thereby by acting would have learned to realize their feelings, to 'learn of his doctrine by obedience to his precepts,' and thus to form in themselves the habit of acting upon their motives, are now taught to rest upon their feelings, to exult in them, to talk of them until their feelings evaporate, and they, having never realized them in any way, fall away. Many, too, uninstructed and unread in the Holy Scriptures, who truly repent, are left to their own ignorance and imaginations, who would have been put under a prescribed course of instruction but that Solifidianism denies at once the authority of a Church and the necessity of knowledge. And so men who by this means would have been instructed to distinguish between mere sensuous emotions and earthly terror and true repentance and sorrow for sin, are crammed into religious societies as truly converted. These men, under an authoritative course of instruction and guidance, would either, the warmth of their emotions rendering them pliable to the master's hand, have been led on to a true faith in Christ, or else have never disgraced the name of Christian. We need not specify the many evils attendant upon the profession of Christianity among the sects. They are manifest even to the sober and thoughtful among themselves. Would that their source were equally manifest—that the truth were to them as plainly discernible, that these things are inherent in the Solfidian system, the natural shoots and offsprings of it. For wherefore should you require of a man to be instructed in God's word or his law, to attain to knowledge, or 'to works meet for repentance,' according to the direction and under the authority of the Church, who is justified by an internal emotion which he calls faith without the works, not of the Jewish law only, or of the law of nature, but of the law of God, of Christ, and of grace? For such in its actual working and practical issue is the amount of Solifidianism.

We say then that the effect of this doctrine is that it destroys the actual and practical power of the Gospel over human nature—it cuts away its applicability to it save in one point—it destroys the means of realizing the Gospel by acting upon it, and is itself the fruitful cause of all the religious evils of the day. Nothing can heal its evils save an abandonment of it and a return to the true doctrine of faith and works—the doctrine that Christians must act instead of putting all upon feeling, and that the business of the Church is to teach them authoritatively how to act. Her doctrine that justifying faith has a corresponding line of Christian action, clearly distinguishable from mere heathen morality. And as soon as men have cast aside this notion of 'faith without works,' so soon will they be enabled to see that the New Testament is a law of spiritual action, as clearly distinct from the mere natural benevolence and heathen morality upon which Solifidianism drives the so called Christian world, as that again from the systematic selfishness of the mere worldly man.

Having thus described Solifidianism, we shall go on in our next essay to describe its effects upon the death-bed, both as regards the common opinion of what the death-bed should be, and also as regards the Solifidian method of dealing both with the sinner and the professing Christian in that, the last solemn scene, of man's life.

W. A.

---

To the true Christian the cares of life shall be an easy tolerable yoke, and all the joys of his heart shall be deeper and more lasting. If we take all things as from God, and behold all things as in the light of the brightness of His coming, all shall be well. In a little while all will be unravelled, and the snares and bonds of life be broken, and we shall be where no man can be entangled, or offend, or fall any more. A little while, and the veil which hangs between heaven and earth shall be rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and all that you have here held of God and for God you shall carry with you into the holy place; and all that has gone before you shall be found perfect at the feet of our Great High Priest, who standeth before the eternal throne.—*Manning.*

---

For the Churchman.

## On the Means of Supporting the Christian Ministry.

*Mr. Editor.*—The paragraph in the Churchman of May 24th, concerning the weekly communion *and offerings for the clergyman's support*, was read by me with very great pleasure; and it forced upon my mind the reflection, that the ways God ordains for us are indeed the most fruitful of good; for they are not only intrinsically the best, as devised by Divine wisdom, but as exclusively *entitled* to the Divine blessing. We ought to recognize it as a universal law, that the way of man is not in himself, and that it *will* be well with those whose steps are directed by the "One Lawgiver."—Let us see if we can find any divine law defining the proportion of our earnings which ought to go into the treasury of God for the support of those who 'minister at the altar.'

St. Paul tells us (Gal. iii.) that the Gospel was preached unto Abraham; and in this chapter and in Rom. xxviii, he demonstrates that the faith of Abraham was the result, not of the law, which was 430 years after, but of this preached Gospel; so that he became 'the father' of all them that believe. And let us bear in mind, that as the children inherit the faith and blessings of the father, so the law of the fathers is binding on his house and children after him. Now, can we not find an historical event in the life of Abraham connected evidently with the preaching of the Gospel *and the support of its ministers?* Melchisedec, *a king and priest*, in this double capacity a most singular type of our Lord, who is a 'priest after the order of Melchisedec'—this Gospel priest met Abraham with BREAD AND WINE, evidently foreshowing the most Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord, the great thing in the Gospel, to wit, THE FOOD OF LIFE:—and Abraham gave him 'TITHES OF ALL.' He gave them as to GOD THE UNIVERSAL LANDLORD; for he gave them to the 'priest of the Most High God,' POSSESSOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH. Now, the tenant has no shadow of right to the Landlord's portion; otherwise he is Proprietor and no tenant. But 'the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof;' and therefore no man can have right to a foot of it except as a tenant at will. His gift to us is not to make us independent of Him, but that we may receive blessing in the use of His creatures. And indeed His way is to give back immediately, though indirectly, to the people the portion they render to Him, in giving it to the priest; who is thus constituted God's stipendiary, and not the people's hired servant, and not so to be treated without most grievous sin, and danger of killing heresy. The law of the father binds the children. This is *why* we use the Holy Creeds and Formularies our fathers inherited from their fathers. So when Jacob, driven out pennyless from his father's house, had his vision of the future Church of the Gospel—'the *pillar* and ground of the truth,' he vowed to fulfil the law of 'the father of all them that believe,' in returning to God *the tenth of all his increase.* The 'pillar' he set up was a witness thereto. In Heb. vii. the Apostle shows that even Levi, to whom tithes were given by the law, paid tithes in Abraham, not to Melchisedec merely, but to Him 'of whom it is witnessed that He liveth.' Melchisedec received them *as a type of our Lord.* But unless it be the way of God for the ministers of the Gospel to receive tithes on the behalf of their Master, who is received or rejected in their persons, here is a type which can have no fulfilment, which makes a lie of, and no true sign. The 'change of the law' (Heb. vii. 12–15,) is not to abolish tithes, which it could not do, for tithes were a part of the faith which Abraham had before he was circumcised; but to transfer the tithes from that priesthood which was abolished, to the priesthood of the royal order which endureth forever.

It is worthy of remark, that Christendom as one received the law of tithes, until priesthood began to be denied, and the Church began to be so much broken up into sect and division as it is now.

Tithes ought to be enforced by no means other than the faithful teaching and setting forth of God's word and God's ways; and the Holy Ghost in the conscience of the people is the only power that ought to be appealed to in the matter. The law of tithes, as seen in the case of Jacob, requires that all persons not under parents or guardians, and having any manner of income, should scrupulously tithe all their clear profits; and this as often as the circumstances of their business and times of receiving will permit, as common prudence will teach. God complains by the prophet that his people rob Him in two particulars,—'in tithes and offerings.' Tithes, by being defined by a law, and given to the priesthood, are a matter of justice and righteousness; and the observance thereof toward God would compel a man to be exact and punctual in the care and management of his business, that he might know always just what God's reserved portion amounts to, and bring up *as tythe* neither too much nor too little. Offerings, being the fruit of liberality, fall under the head of love, over and beyond exact righteousness. But if a man should tithe at random, without a correct knowledge of his affairs, he must offer in the dark as well as tithe in the dark; which is not the way for 'children of the light,' and children of '*faithful* Abraham,' of whom God said, 'I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment.'

In France, all descriptions of clergy and ministers—of all sects, are *mere* stipendiaries of the State. Of course, none of them can be faithful to God; for no man can serve two masters. They all rob God of tithes, which the rulers and people divide among themselves; while the priests are mere political tools to serve the ends of State policy, and not to glorify God in the Gospel of His Son.

Under the *voluntary* system, where no law of God is propounded to the conscience of the people, and nothing but their liberality is appealed to, the minister becomes the mere stipendiary of the people, who cannot, in most cases, but regard him as working for hire, as all hirelings work—and not standing as God's ambassador supported out of God's treasury, by Him who is the people's Landlord. In His way, a priest is under neither compliment nor obligation to a tythe payer, as was demonstrated in the old way of offering the tithes to God in the Communion Service before the priests could lawfully use them. The voluntary principle cannot but allow men to feel as if their purse strings had power to strangle an obnoxious minister quite as efficiently and more easily than by trial before his Bishop. A man to do his duty well must be responsible to none but his own master, and, in some sense, wholly independent of those over whom he is set. The voluntary system equally robs God of tithes and offerings with any other.

In England, the enforcement of tithes by law is a profane attempt to enforce by the arm of flesh the obedience which should be the sole fruit of the conscience enlightened of the Holy Ghost. It places the priesthood in a very bad position—not exactly as stipendiaries of the State, but as dependent for support on the continuance of that enforcement by the State. Of course they cannot be free as God's stipendiaries and ambassadors. A political revolution may take away the support of the State, and leave the people free to do as they please. And since acts of parliament have more been pleaded on behalf of tithes than the law of God, it is pretty certain that the repeal of those acts would well nigh abolish tithes in England, as in that case no man would bring them up but from a conscience of God's law and a heart of obedience to it as unto Him and not unto men. Of course these would be immensely in the minority, the people generally not being otherwise taught.

The sectarian teachers in England and Ireland who receive a stipend from the State, are just in the position of political demagogues whom the governwent *hires not to stir up rebellion.* A more filthy condition than this can hardly be found for ministers of the Gospel; and it is hardly possible that men thus circumstanced could train up people to be legal and true subjects. Loyalty may be found among them, but it cannot possibly be the fruit of such a system of policy; and I firmly believe the history of Dissent would fully bear me out in this position.

Much reflection has brought me to the conclusion that the Church ought never to have held real estate by title deeds, no, not so much as to build a house upon. She ought to have cast herself upon the support of God, coming through the piety of the people in tithes and offerings; and a house for worship once consecrated to the service of God would have been secure from the same cause. Neither magistrate nor people would have dared to meddle with it. The very holding of land by title deed brings the Church under bondage to the powers that be, and gives them a fair pretext for meddling in things that do not belong to them: and that law of the State of New York, for instance, which regulates a matter of Churchwardenship, is as gross a violation of the essential freedom of the Church as is the nomination of Bishops by the King of England. The State has no right whatever to meddle in any thing pertaining to the economy of the Church; but the holding of real estate by title deed presupposes that power, and acknowledges that right as far as relates to the economy of the deaconship; and the Church has done wrong in ever submitting herself to such humiliating terms.

I do not mean to say that priests in their necessary capacity of citizens should not hold real estate, but that the Church should not, as a body corporate under the authority of the State. Neither do I say that, the thing having been universally done, we should run headlong out of it; for as things are the attempt might but add to the mischief; but that we should see the sin and confess it, and seek to God to open a way of deliverance in peace and quiet in His own time, and patiently abide under the captivity until then.

The example of our father Abraham and all the ancient patriarchs is here in point. They were strangers and sojourners in the very land of promise. God gave to Abraham none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession;" and on the faith of this he died a stranger in his own future inheritance and possession. And so the Psalmist saith, 'I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner in the earth, as all my fathers were.' Our Lord is to inherit the heathen, and possess the uttermost parts of the earth; and the joint heirs with Him are to be kings and priests, and to reign on the earth. But heretofore this right could not be acted upon by divine warrant, and cannot be, until the time comes when the saints of the Most High shall take the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven. But till then the Church as such, and as heir of the world, should ever have followed the example of Abraham, and of her Lord who had not where to lay his head. Instead of holding lands of kings, she should have treated kings as all other men, as unable to confer upon the heirs of the world any rights, and taught them to honor God as other men by bringing up their tithes and offerings to His Altar set among them for their benefit in common with other men. The very taking of title deeds and holding real estate, and this 'forever,' is an indirect assumption that the kingdom has come, and is vested in those who give title deeds to the 'heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.'

Nothing could operate more to make the Church forget, and so not desire the second coming of her Lord, than the holding of earthly possessions, and so be led to interfere in the politics of princes and States, instead of teaching truth, and leaving it to them whom God ordained to do it, to put that truth into practice in legislation and government. Now, in some lands, what fears of losing Church property! and at different times, how have wicked men robbed the Church!

In Upper Canada one-seventh of the land was set apart in lieu of tithes—God's ordinance was set aside out of fear of the people. But has it prospered? Nay, verily. The Clergy Reserves have, for near thirty years, been the political capital of every demagogue and sectarian leader, until the greater part has been robbed and squandered away from the Church to whom it was given. How much better than to amass possessions in lands for fear there will be no support for the clergy, is the practice of the good priest and his flock at Ashtabula, Ohio! Weekly communion—no subscriptions—but weekly offerings for the pastor—and he 'never fared better!' 'Tithes and offerings,' thus far, would be perfect.

I have written, Mr. Editor, because I love the Church, and fully believe the old ways the best for her. I want no tithe-gatherer but conscience of God's law, the best guard in the world. And I beg to conclude this communication by stating that it comes from one who, for the last eight years, has regularly tithed every dollar of his income, and who rejoices before God that he has had the grace to do it.

Yours, &c. Catholicus.

---

For the Churchman.

*Mr. Editor,*—Much has been written and said upon the subject of the New York troubles—but little, however, if any thing, has reached the public ear, from the frontier Dioceses. This silence is not the result, I am persuaded, of indifference in regard to the afflictions of our distant brethren or their persecuted Bishop; on the contrary, a deep and thrilling interest has been felt by us during the entire progress of events. That trial, Mr. Editor, was but the conclusion of the tragedy; and when God in His infinite justice shall prepare the way for unreserved revelations respecting it, it will be seen that the whole contrivance was ingenious and complete; wanting in nothing of safe dramatic arrangement; having prologue, scenery and *dénouement;* actors, both stars and subordinates; artificial whisperers and thunderers; together with clear-voiced prompters, almost (not entirely) hid amid the shadows of the scenery. It is not my purpose to enlarge now upon this point; though so far as my observation has extended, (and it has not been limited to a narrow sphere,) a large majority of Churchmen entertain no doubt as to the existence of a conspiracy against the Bishop of New York, dating back months prior to the General Convention, and having its agents as far as possible from the city of New York. Candid men, beyond the circumference of spiritual excitement, reason thus: "Why was the peace of the Church disturbed by raking up old charges against one who is now living, and has for years lived exemplary and consistent; even admitting his guilt, as respects the particulars alleged by his accusers, at the time specified, yet what good motive—what but a malicious one—could prompt men to unbury, and blazon to the world errors—crimes if you please—long past, and almost forgotten, thus bringing reproach upon the Church from without, and bowing in sorrow the hearts of Churchmen? Why did not the trial *ostensibly* originate in New York where the Bishop was known, (for good or evil,) where his alleged guilt was incurred, where there must surely be conscientious men to vindicate the purity of the Church, and where is not wanting the stimulus of official and personal dislike, and even hostility towards the suspected individual? Why did a nominal High Churchman start the business? *This looks like arranging for effect.* Why, especially did Mr. Memminger so gratuitously exculpate the distinguished presbyter from Mississippi when that gentleman had not been publicly accused? Why cause the "whisperings," so "distressing" in South Carolina, an exact counterpart of contemporaneous "whisperings" in "Mississippi?" This kind of reasoning and interrogation, Mr. Editor, is in every body's mouth here in this remote region. It is the language, not of distrust only as to the righteousness of that proceeding, but of settled conviction of its stupendous iniquity! People put things and circumstances together by way of illustration, and thus make sober conclusions. They call to mind the scenes they themselves have witnessed, the predictions they themselves have heard, not only of the result itself long before it transpired, but of many details which could be known only to one having an agency in pre-conceiving and planning the sad affair. Thus they can have but one judgment, which is, that a deliberate conspiracy was formed by the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk—that the agency of persons in different parts of the country was secured—that scandalous reports were to be zealously circulated respecting Bishop Onderdonk, in company, in private, in public places, in steamboats, on railroads, until it would seem to be necessary to investigate the rumors; then the first movement was to come from South Carolina, and from one holding opinions avowedly in accordance with the accused. Undoubtedly many involved in the proceedings were ignorant of the conspiracy they were promoting. They were used as tools by more sagacious and more wicked persons; but that there *was* a conspiracy to "*crush*" Bishop Onderdonk (in the language of one his distinguished enemies) is most evident to the observing here, and *will yet be proved to the satisfaction of all.*

One word about resignation. The whisperers are endeavoring to "whisper" out its necessity. They say the Bishop's influence is dead; that it cannot be revived; that public opinion would be outraged by his again resuming the duties of his office; that nobody would be found in the churches where he was to officiate; that his restoration would injure the Church in the estimation of "other denominations." Now, Mr. Editor, I have no hesitation in saying that no more injurious blow could be inflicted upon the Church than for Bishop Onderdonk to yield to these efforts of his enemies. The voices of true Churchmen unite in protesting against resignation. His, and the Church's foes only, desire it. Many considerations combine to give force to this protest. Not Bishop Onderdonk only, but Catholic Truth is the object of attack; to yield, will be to sacrifice this Truth. More;—no Bishop holding opinions contrary to those held by this faction, and in accordance with those of the victim of their late persecution, would be safe in such an event. Their plans are not yet all executed. They still allege "Puseyism" against others upon the Episcopal bench, and by some means, directly or indirectly, these men are to be got rid of. "Whisperers" can be obtained—are ready—have already begun—and success in securing the resignation of Bishop Onderdonk is all that is wanting to inspire them with confidence for the prosecution of their work. The Bishop of New York, then, will not resign—cannot. He must be encouraged to suffer on for the sake of the Church. The Diocese of New York must make the sacrifices necessary to secure this end; in God's good time relief will come to both; justice will be done, and principle and truth will triumph.

South West.

---

So far as the eye of the world reaches, the holy Catholic Church is no more than any other visible polity, and not the richest nor strongest, nor, in an earthly sense, the most politic or prosperous. On the whole, though it is evidently something that has its own character and its own meaning, and is fulfilling some definite aim, whatsoever that aim be—and the world little knows or cares—still it has no overwhelming proofs of sanctity, no obtrusive tokens of a hidden life. Though it be both holy and visible, yet there is an inwardness and retirement about it, even in its visibleness. And what is this but to say, that it is perfection dwelling in an imperfect form; eternity in time; heaven in earth; infinity in the finite; a shadow of its mysterious Head, in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily?" And therefore the Church has seemed at times to wane and to wax dim, and at times to grow dark outwardly; at the best it has exhibited to the world but a chequered light; rather a promise than a full orb of brightness.—*Manning.*

---

For the Churchman.

## Tracts for the Seasons.

NO. XXXII.

In order to our obtaining eternal salvation by Jesus Christ, God has been pleased to appoint sundry means and conditions. These indeed have no inherent efficacy, but derive all their value from His appointment. Our natural weakness renders us unable to apply these means, and perform these conditions, except by the directing and aiding influences of the Holy Ghost; while our frailty, corruption, and sinfulness mar our very best services with so much of imperfection as would effectually prevent their acceptance with God, but for His unmerited sparing mercy in Jesus Christ.

These are the qualifications under which, agreeably to Evangelical doctrine, we maintain the efficacy of means and conditions to be performed by man in order to his enjoying the benefits of grace and salvation of which Christ's mediation is the only procuring and meritorious cause.

The most general head under which these means and conditions are ranked in Scripture, is membership of the Church of Christ, connected with the true maintenance of its faith, and the right discharge of its obligations and responsibilities. For extending to men the privileges of this membership, and directing and aiding them in its duties, the Ministry has been appointed and is commissioned. By its instrumentality entrance into the Church, that is into covenant with God, is to be obtained, the conditions of the covenant to be explained, its seals and pledges, and the means of its blessings, to be administered, and thus the Christian helped onward in the way that leads to its eternal reward.

The functions of the ministry, being thus an embassy from God to man, and in the stead of the direct and immediate interposition of God's mercy in our behalf, necessarily suppose a commission from God as alone conferring a title to the exercise of them. A very serious question then arises, and one which, however a worldly spirit may lightly regard it, or brand it as bigotted or uncharitable, enters into the very essence of the Evangelical system—How are we to know by whom this commission is held; and consequently from whom religious ordinances and administrations can be received with reasonable certainty of their being such, in all things requisite to the same, as the Gospel requires, in order to their being entitled to confidence as embraced within its covenant provisions?

A man, unacknowledged by any religious society as an authorized minister, takes "upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments." Who would think it wrong, uncharitable, or unimportant, to pause before he receives him in his assumed character, or consents to wait on his ministrations; and to ask whether he is lawfully doing what he has undertaken? He may, worthy reader, be your friend or neighbor, and you may know him to be an honest man, and a man of piety, of talents, and of zeal. Will all this reconcile you to his taking upon himself, without even the semblance of an outward appointment, a claim to the character, and the performance of the duties, of a Christian minister? Even if it did, would you think yourself justified in accusing a friend of bigotry or uncharitableness because he cannot agree with you?

A number of laymen form a congregation, and appoint one of themselves, or any other layman, to be their minister, and perhaps, in token of their choice, lay their hands upon him, and declare him to be their pastor. Would it be uncharitable to ask who gave them authority to commission a minister, and consequently by what authority he undertakes to officiate as such?

Probably by far the greatest number of Christians profess to regard ordination of some kind necessary for a man's investiture with the pastoral office. Would they acknowledge it to be uncharitable, and laying too much stress on an unimportant matter, to hesitate about receiving, or even candidly to refuse to receive, as a minister, one who had never been ordained or set apart in any way; and to be unwilling to present their children to him for Baptism, to receive elements administered by him, as the Holy Communion, or to sanction in any way his assuming the office of a preacher of the Gospel?

It is very generally conceded among Christians that ordination to the ministry must be given, not by lay members of the Church, but by those already in orders. Would they who conscientiously cherish this view admit as just the charge of uncharitableness, or of giving undue importance to trifles, because they cannot own or encourage as a Gospel minister one who has been ordained only by his people?

The application of this principle is extended, but by no means changed in character, by proceeding another step. Among those who maintain the necessity of ordination by the ministry there are two classes—they who think that the power to ordain is given to ministers generally, the ministry consisting of but one order, and they who believe that the ministry was divided by Christ into three orders, He conferring the ordaining power only on the first. The first of these classes do not admit that one without any ordination, or one lay-ordained, has a right to minister in the word and sacraments, and regard as unjust the imputation upon them, on this account, of uncharitableness and an undue magnifying of trifles. Neither therefore can the second class be justly thus charged by extending the principle one step further, and ranking those ordained on the system of parity, or presbyterial ordination, with the unordained, and the lay-ordained, because they cannot admit that presbyters were invested by Christ with any more ordaining power than laymen.

All these several kinds of ministry prefer their claims to the acceptance and encouragement of Christians. We have those among us calling themselves ministers of the Gospel, and admitted by good people to be such, who never received any ordination; those who were ordained by members of their respective congregations; those who were ordained by a presbytery or company of persons sustaining the pastoral office as held to be of but one order; and those who were ordained by Bishops as the first of three orders of pastors, and alone empowered to ordain.

If all these are true ministers of the Gospel, Christ has either made no provision in His Church for perpetuating His ministry, or made such provision as tends to disunion and distraction.

The sincere Christian, he who has a single eye to the will of his divine Lord and Master, and wishes to serve Him in the way of His own appointments, will regard it as a matter of very important, serious, and conscientious inquiry, where the truth lies amid these divers and conflicting claims. Knowing that it is his duty to be in covenant with God by living in union and communion with His Church, and humbly to avail himself of the functions of Christ's ministers, as the means and pledges of salvation through Christ, he considers it his bounden duty to have full and enlightened satisfaction on the momentous question where that Church and ministry are to be found.

As a guide in this important inquiry the Church proposes her Twenty-third Article of Religion. It is in these words:—

"*Of Ministering in the Congregation.*

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public Preaching, or Ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this Work by men who have public Authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's Vineyard."

The Church here decides, first, that no man has a right to exercise the functions of the Christian ministry simply on the ground of his possessing the proper religious, moral, and intellectual qualifications, or of any impressions of duty, however sincere, deep, or solemn. He must "be lawfully called and sent to execute the same." And who are the lawfully called and sent? The Church determines,

Secondly, that the calling and sending must come *not from the people*, but,

Thirdly, from "men who have public authority given unto them," not *by* but "*in*, the congregation (in ecclesia," in the Church) "to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

The article does not particularly state who they are that have this authority—authority to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard, and therefore authority that can come only from "the Lord" Himself. Elsewhere, however, the Church supplies this deficiency. In the preface to the Ordinal,* she declares that "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he hath had episcopal consecration or ordination;" that is, consecration or ordination by a Bishop as the first of three orders in the ministry. This determination the Church grounds on the authority of "Holy Scripture," in its clear record of facts respecting the Apostolic Church, and of the principles on which it was administered; and in that full development of its true sense and meaning which is found in "ancient authors" or primitive Catholic tradition. On the same authority, too, she solemnly sets forth the *divine appointment*† of the divers orders of ministers with which this doctrine of episcopacy is connected.

Such is the decision of the Church on the momentous question, Who may lawfully "take upon himself the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation?" She determines it to be him only who has been regularly called and sent by a Bishop of the Church of God, that is by a member of the first of those divers orders of ministers which God appointed for that Church.‡

Such are the principles, and such is the authoritative decision, of the Church on this momentous subject. They should be seriously laid to heart by those whose duty it is to be taught by the Church, and especially those who are bound to impart her teachings to others. The lamentably prevalent indifference on religious subjects, and disinclination for purely religious views of the Church, are in strong contrast with those teachings. Let but popular eloquence, or something new or strange be presented as pulpit attraction, some great talent real or imaginary be exhibited, some blazoned piety, zeal, or deeds, be held forth, or some unwonted enterprise proposed, and what crowds of professing Christians, yes and professing Churchmen too, will rush to gratify an itching ear. They ask not, Who is this that comes as a messenger from the Lord of Hosts, or who hath sent Him? They wait not to know whether it is lawful for him to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments.—Suppose it is not. Suppose he has entered uncalled and unsent by those who alone can lawfully call and send, on the holy work. At what a price do they who encourage and abet him purchase the gratification of their curiosity, or the credit of liberality!

If an inquiry into the lawfulness of the ministrations of those who come before us as God's clergy, is not right, then has there been no divine appointment on the subject of the ministerial commission. If piety and sincerity are the proof of that commission, then every pious and sincere man is an authorized minister. If *success*, the commission of the *agent* cannot be severed from approval of his *work*; and then—to say nothing of false *religions*—many of the worst papal and protestant counterfeits of Gospel writers have had Heaven's high sanction.

If we would attend the preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments, according to Christ's ordinance, it must be where these functions are exercised by those who are duly called and sent. Principles or conduct otherwise regulated cannot be according to Christ's ordinance; but have in themselves a natural tendency to the uprooting of the whole Gospel scheme.

The Christian who is truly conscientious and anxious in things pertaining to Evangelical principles and duty, is moved to the most serious consideration of this subject because of the present prevalent spirit of religious indifference. This is indeed termed liberality, and under the magic influence of that name, is luring professed disciples of the Redeemer from the dearest and most essential principles of the Gospel, and combining in a mighty mass of opposition to the integrity of the truth as it is Jesus, the most discordant and heterogeneous materials. It is a liberality, however, far removed from the teachings of the Apostles, as it is also from those of the blessed saints and martyrs who first followed them in the care and instruction of the Church. They taught the Gospel as they received it, enforcing in God's name, and by authority from Him, the essential connection between the unity of the Church, the unity of the faith, and the integrity and soundness of Evangelical piety. And of one thing the Bible clearly assures us, and the warning voice of history, and of every day's observation adds confirmation, that until the Christian world is herein brought to agreement with itself, the day of the Gospel's triumph cannot be expected.

May the Holy Ghost inspire the members of the Church with that true knowledge and just appreciation of its principles, that ardent, enlightened, and consistent devotion to its interests, and that living union with its Divine Head, which, through His blessing, will tend to the strengthening of its unity, the promotion of its welfare, and the enlargement of its borders, until it becomes the joy of the whole earth!

B. T. O.

---

* "The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

† "Almighty God, Who, by Thy Holy Spirit, hast appointed *divers orders* of ministers in the Church."—*The Collect in the Ordering of Priests.*

‡ It has sometimes been said that the language above quoted from the preface to the Ordinal does not speak the sense of the Church on *the general subject of valid ordination*, but only an order for *her own direction*—a sort of *mere municipal or local regulation.* "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, *in this Church.*" Therefore, it is argued, there is no declaration here respecting the ministry in the Christian Church at large. Our Standards do not say that Episcopal ordination is necessary for the *Christian* ministry; but only for the ministry *in this Church.* In other words, we do not say to a non-Episcopal minister, you must receive orders from a Bishop, to make you a Christian minister; but only, You must receive orders from a Bishop, to make you a minister of *this Church.* But what is the ordination she provides for non-Episcopal ministers. They must enter the class of *lay-candidates*—a strange procedure if she is not verily persuaded that they are not ministers of Christ. Having served this probation, they are—what?—to be received as ministers of *this Church?* Not so. As *laymen* again they are, as other laymen, to be invested with office by the laying on of hands with the words, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in *the Church of God* committed unto thee;" and afterwards to be admitted to higher functions, by the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work" (or "Take thou authority to execute the office) of a Priest in *the Church of God* now committed to thee." Can any reasonable construction—indeed any construction consistent with the integrity and piety of the Church—be put upon all this, which will not repudiate at once the idea that the Church admits these persons to have been already ministers of the Church of God? It is not thus she receives ministers of the Church of Rome. Under due canonical regulations, she takes them to be lawful Priests and Deacons "*in this Church,*" not by requiring them to be ordained "*in the Church of God,*" but by a process which recognizes them as *already ministers of the Church of God*, because they have "*had episcopal ordination.*"

---

For the Churchman.

*Mr. Editor,*—In reflecting upon matters and things of present interest and moment, two circumstances have strongly impressed me as indicative of the desperation to which Bishop Onderdonk's enemies appear to be brought.

*The pulling down of Mr. Carey's monument*, was an act of vandalism disgraceful to a civilized and Christian community; and mournfully indicative of the extent to which party malignity and bitterness will go in superseding the virtuous instincts of our nature, and rooting out the holy influences of our faith.

In the madness excited by the judgment of the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary in the matter of the Professorship filled by the Bishop, it has been proposed to annihilate at once the carefully and well devised Constitution of the Seminary, which was the result of the deliberation and labors of some of the wisest and best of the bishops, clergy, and laity of our Church. If this cannot be done in the constitutionally provided mode of alteration, it is proposed to call in the aid of the civil arm, and petition our Legislature to *repeal the Seminary's charter.* A ground of hope of the success of such a petition is unblushingly vaunted in the sad infidel tendencies which, in the last session of that body, saw something suspiciously sectarian in the term Trinity, and made a bold and uncalled for attack on one of the noblest endowments in our land for *Christian education.*

Then we have had appeals to Bishops to be influenced in their solemn official responsibilities by mere obstinate defiance of the disfavor with which their proceedings have been regarded by a large portion of the Church; and to seek vengeance on the majority of the Trustees of the Seminary by refusing to sanction their re-appointment by their respective dioceses.

Such are the principles and spirit which the Church in the Diocese of New York is called to meet.

Obsta.

---

For the Churchman.

*Mr. Editor,*—Great fault has been found with Bishop Onderdonk and his friends because of the view they take of the issue of his trial, and because of their alleged resistance of the sentence.

It is true, they have thought that the verdict was not justified by the testimony, and have regarded the sentence as an unlawful one, and a nullity.

In these views they have been sustained, as is well known, by a large minority of the Court, and by able jurists and divines in all parts of the country, and indeed beyond the bounds of our Republic, as well as by other citizens of respectability and intelligence, well versed in the duties and responsibilities of jurors. It surely must be entirely inconsistent with sound reason and Christian principle to fault them, when honestly and conscientiously cherishing such views, for fearlessly expressing them. No one not blinded by prejudice or passion will say that it is fitting for an American citizen, or a sound Protestant to object to the most rigid examination of the decisions and acts of ecclesiastical bodies, or to the right of every one to express his opinion freely respecting them.* And most especially revolting is such objection, when the matter under consideration involves an issue more important than that of life and death.

As to the alleged *resistance of the sentence* on the part of Bishop Onderdonk and his friends no accusation can be more unjust. What can be submission if the Bishop's uniform deportment has not been? He and his friends are for submitting to the sentence exactly as it is—*suspension.* They are not for changing it to *deposition.* They are not for charging the Court with doing one thing and meaning another. They are not for adding to the sentence by resignation on the part of the Bishop. Such an act in some views of it, would aggravate the sentence. This, no man of Christian piety and charity would wish to do. In other views it may be regarded as lightening the sentence. This, proper allegiance to the Court forbids. The pre-eminently unjust ground has been taken that the Bishop should resign *in order to relieve the diocese from trouble and perplexity.* According to the view of the matter taken by the Bishop and his friends, the diocese has been brought into this trouble and perplexity by a most faulty canon of the General Convention, and by an unjust verdict, and an illegal sentence of an ecclesiastical Court. These *their* sins, *he* is called to shoulder, and to bend under them to the death!! Means too have been used to coerce resignation, of the most unworthy character, and such, assuredly, as unbiassed self-examination, and especially solemn Christian scrutiny into preparation for the account of the Great Day, can hardly regard as comporting with the pure, just, and holy morals of the Gospel.

The Bishop and his friends say, Stand by the Sentence. As for the diocese it has sins enough to deserve God's chastisement. Let it not be impatient and restless; but humbled, submissive, and drawn into greater fidelity to its Divine Lord, and a holier allegiance to His Church. It has experienced abundantly enough of the unmerited kindness and love of God to encourage its faith, and hope, and trust, that His good providence and grace will yet be experienced to be sufficient even for its needed *great deliverance.*

Jireh.

---

* I have before me a newspaper in which the acting Bishop of Mississippi is represented as severely chiding in his address to the Convention of that Diocese, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the last General Convention, for neglecting their duty, and shrinking from their proper responsibility, in the matter of the charges brought against the Rev. Dr. Hawks.

---

For the Churchman.

### Smuggled Catholicism in our Liturgy.

*Mr. Editor,*—Accept the thanks of a son of the Church, as you have already, I doubt not those of many, for your justly indignant exposure (on the 16th inst.) of the mendacity of the Christian Observer, in ascribing 'foisting, stealthiness, smuggling,' to the re-introduction of the Oblation and Invocation into our Eucharistic service. The accusation can only have proceeded from baseness and ignorance; and shows how greatly that periodical has degenerated from the respectable though mistaken course which it held some thirty or forty years ago, while it represented Wilberforce and the "good men of Clapham." Yet *this* imputation could scarcely have been hazarded by an *English* evangelical, I fear, without a backer or rather a prompter (for nobody will back it) on this side of the Atlantic,—some groaning or growling anti-catholic among us, who has despatched his objurgation by steam to the head quarters of the faction:—think you, sir, he admires "the Church as it is!"

The whole imputation, of "smuggling" this Catholicism into our liturgy, is wickedly untrue. When underhand conduct is charged on a body of respectable men, the burden of proof lies on the accuser. He must show, at the least, that the body was palpably open to such a suspicion; and he ought likewise to denote the individuals against whom this "cunning craftiness lying in wait to deceive" may be alleged: for without a presumption made good in its favor, the natural presumption against it must govern. Now, the General Convention of October 1789 consisted of less than forty persons, from nine different States, and representing ten, too few in number, and too diverse in local feelings, to be readily liable to *management;* they were in session but seventeen days, a very brief period for tampering or cajoling; and there was no collateral object before the Convention, whether in the House or out of it, nothing but the Liturgy, after the union of the Church was agreed upon,—no Society or Board, no Seminary, no College as its feeder, not even a squabble (whether latent or explicit) concerning justification, or a contested episcopal consecration,—no earthly inducement whatever to tempt one man of them to submit to act otherwise than for the common welfare. And as to individuals; only three, I apprehend, had any influence worthy of note in this argument, Bishops Seabury and White, and Dr. W. Smith, the President of the House of Deputies. Of these, Bishop Seabury was an above-board man in every thing, beyond the very surmise of artful dealing or indirection: in fact, none but a puny mind and contemptible heart can ascribe any thing of the sort to the noble spirit which shook itself free from the imposing and almost imperative and domineering tardiness of the English prelates of that day, and went with manly boldness to ask consecration of the despised and persecuted non-juring bishops in Scotland. As decidedly above *all* manœuvre and trickery was Bishop White, as hundreds now living can testify, besides that he did not favor the insertion of these parts of the Communion Service: and in conceding to that measure, as he did to effect the conjunction of our then disunited churches,—no one who can pledge a respectable name will charge him with the least obliquity of purpose or of conduct. Dr. Smith also must have been averse to the measure, for his views, like those of most of our southern clergy and not a few of the rest, were uncatholic, as the Proposed Book (of the committee for preparing which, in 1785, he was chairman, and in commendation of which he preached before that Convention by its desire) fully attest; he had had some influence, and, though now advanced in years, without having been promoted to the Episcopate, still retained enough to be made the President of the lower House; and he may have used it (so much of it as remained) to further this change in the Liturgy, though not suiting his own opinions, yet, if so, in a way entirely unexceptionable and for the good of the Church; there was no motive to act otherwise, he being too old to seek a renewed popularity, and the change itself, if denounced as in the days of Laud, being one that would infallibly have excited popular hatred. Moreover, Dr. Smith's character, in the opinion at least of one who knew him well, had in it nothing of 'stealthiness, or foisting, or smuggling,' as the following anecdote will prove:—Many years ago, in conversation with a leading clergyman, yet living and now more eminent, concerning the rubric which requires the ante-communion to be read every Sunday and holy day, he informed me that Dr. Smith, to relieve our Church of that *burdensome* requirement, had (I do not recollect his exact language) 'stealthily smuggled or foisted in' the two words added to those in the English prayer-book, "if there be no *sermon or* communion;" some months afterwards I mentioned this to Bishop White, who instantly contradicted the imputation, as wholly inconsistent with the uniformly honorable deportment of Dr. Smith. Now, I claim that this attestation of the integrity of the first President of our House of Deputies is decisive, till it be overcome by stronger countervailing proof.

To none but these three names in that Convention, though four other members became bishops afterwards, (Parker, Jarvis, B. Moore, and R. Smith,) does recollection or tradition, so far as I am aware, ascribe any leading ecclesiastical influence. And neither of these three, as indeed not an individual in that body, *can* the abominable imputation in the Christian Observer reach.

Bishop Seabury gained his point in this matter, he and his few supporters. The other members of the Convention yielded; a concession however which appears to have cost them little, as there was no opposition, says Bishop White, "to any considerable extent." In that day, the Athanasian Creed and the article of the Descent into Hell occupied far more the thoughts of Episcopalians; and the Convention gave itself up to these questions, as "the principal subjects of difference." (Bishop White, p. 149.) Yet enough attention was given to the Eucharistic acts before us, as you have well shown in your editorial of the 16th, to leave utterly inexcusable the charge of their being furtively introduced: "a few gentlemen" (the whole number being but thirty odd) opposed them in the House of Deputies, and the President "counteracted" their objections "by some pertinent remarks;" in other words, there was an open debate on the subject, though not of long continuance,—*no such thing* as 'foisting, stealthiness, or smuggling,' in any shape or under any construction whatsoever,—that charge being a simple and unmitigated lie. This phrase only, sir, is mine; the matter of the assertion is Bishop White's;—'let him that cavilleth understand.'

Bishop Seabury gained this point, the Eucharistic Oblation and Invocation. He lost the other, the Athanasian Creed. Why not then accuse him of treachery in being defeated concerning the latter, as well as of a fraudulent victory in carrying the former! As to the Descent into Hell, the action on it was sadly bungled. (See Bishop White.)

Look at a further result of this allegation of "smuggling." Whoever was wheedled into the measure, Bishop White was not; for he was expert in this department of theology, and must have seen through the deception, had one been attempted. Yet he silenced his conscience and furthered the trickery! wilfully soiled his integrity and betrayed his friends, to do what would give countenance to a doctrine which he did not believe, and which his one *nay* in the House of Bishops could defeat! So must argue the Christian Observer. Yes, and more atrocious even than this must be the vituperation,—for Bishop White never acknowledged the "stealthiness," or made amends for it, to the end of his long life,—nay, he twice published what is grossly untrue, if there were any "stealthiness" in the proceedings!

But the point so unscrupulously raised does not rest in the personal character of individuals; the recorded proceedings (see Bioren's edition) of the Convention will settle it. They were too gradual and deliberate to admit of any member's being taken by surprise. First, there were three or four days consumed in settling and ratifying the constitution and union. Then, the House of Deputies was fourteen days in session, from October 3 to 16 inclusive, and deducting two Sundays (4th and 11th) and Wednesday (7th) they had eleven business days: the House of Bishops commenced its session on Monday the 5th. On the 3rd, the Deputies appointed a committee of five on the Communion service, the Rev. Mr. Pilmore being chairman, which reported on the 9th; the report was considered on the 11th; and again "considered by paragraphs, and agreed to," on the 13th; and in the afternoon of that day, it was ordered to be transmitted to the Bishops. The latter House, "having prepared their proposals" on this subject on the 8th, returned to the Deputies their service with amendments on the 14th; and these amendments "were concurred in, except one, which being withdrawn by this House, the service was passed." The general subject was thus twelve days before the Deputies, and the report on it six days; the Bishops giving seven days to the matter. And the Convention remained in session two days longer, on the last of which the Communion for the Sick was agreed to; time and opportunity being thus afforded for a reconsideration, should that be desired,—for waking up the guardians of the Church, had they 'slept while the enemy was sowing tares!'

What greater deliberation could there be? what more effectual security against stratagem?

There are two further considerations, perfectly available from the connection of the Oblation and Invocation with the Priest and Altar question. Allow me to advert briefly to them.

In the English prayer-book, the word *priest*, in the rubrics, is often interchangeable with *minister;* the former being used not only for acts properly sacerdotal, but also for those which may be performed by deacons; in the latter case the appellation is used generically. In the Proposed Book, the word *priest* never occurs, that I discover, whether in the rubrics or the litany, only in the Psalms where it may be figured into nothing; all is to be done by the *minister*, even absolution both in public and with the sick, consecration of the elements, and pronouncing the greater benediction: the Communion rubric reads, "deliver the same to the bishops, *presbyters*, and deacons." In our book, however, adopted in 1789, with both the above formularies before the Convention, the two words are employed discriminately; what must be done by a *priest* is never assigned to a mere *minister;* and what may properly be done by a *deacon* is left open to the officiating *minister* of whatever order. Now, in the Church of England, the generic sense of the word "priest" *may* be held debateable, and, unless there be binding authority other than the rubrics, a deacon *may* consecrate the Eucharist as well as baptise, since he is called a "priest" in the latter function: what the extra-rubrical law may be, I know not; if only the Ordinal, it may be evaded. Yet more clearly, and without any ulterior check, would the Proposed Book (had that misshapen abortion survived) have conferred on deacons this highest sacerdotal power. But in *our* Liturgy, "as it is," the line of priestly work is every where so accurately drawn and preserved, that all misconstruction and all invasion are precluded.—I ask then: is not this intangible priestly exclusiveness the correlative of an Oblation? does not such a priestly office infer a priestly Offering? For what were so accurate rubrics given to our Church, if the completing of their proportions and the filling up of the outlines they draw, by such an Oblatory act may be denounced as 'smuggling, stealthiness, and a foisting in?' In fact, the General Convention of 1789 made our whole Liturgy most explicitly sacerdotal; so completely, that the Eucharistic sacrifice *proper* must have been presumed had it not been expressed and embodied,—whatever might have been the private opinion of its members.

As if in further amends for past remissness, the 1st Canon, first enacted in 1789, declares—"In this Church there shall always be three orders in the ministry, viz: Bishops, *Priests*, and Deacons."

The other consideration is—that our Church, instead of complaining of this liturgical restoration as a sly intruder, has remained perfectly contented with and cordial to it for more than half a century, and has actually introduced into the Prayer-book further matter of the same kind. When the first edition appeared, the words "which we now offer unto thee" were printed conspicuously; this excited remark, as an unauthorized abetting of the sacrificial doctrine, and was corrected: but no one objected that the words themselves had been unwarily adopted. Since then, individuals have occasionally condemned this part of the liturgy, as Bishop White remarks, and as some of us have heard, (*and may further hear;*) but no public complaint has been uttered, or attempt made to have it revoked. In fifteen years, 1804, came the Induction Office, which in 1808 was re-named the Institution Office, in which we have the very words most disputed, "sacerdotal" and "altar," (in the material sense,) a dozen times, besides the word "priest" in that unequivocal connexion: to which Office, as far as I am informed, no person has ever publicly taken exception. And how, in theological consistency, can such a "priest," at such an "altar," fulfil his "sacerdotal" function without an "Oblation?"—Our Church must have been asleep fifteen years, if this were a second taking her by surprise! Nor is she roused yet, even by the outcry of the Christian Observer!

It must not be forgotten that this alarm of the *evangelical* trumpet is an acknowledgment that our Eucharistic service *does* maintain and set forth the sacrificial characte of that high ordinance. Those therefore who deny this we turn over to that periodical, and its friends on either side of the Atlantic; for this *item* of controversy is within their own lines, and must there be settled before it can reach ours.

For myself, I regard the adjustment of our Communion service, and indeed of our Prayer-book at large, as so eminently the work of God, that the interposition of human artifice must have been powerless had it been attempted. Let any one consider the semi-orthodox, unecclesiastical, uncatholic state of the larger portion of our Church in that early period,—let him even form his judgment from the Proposed Book, and the commendation of it by Dr. W. Smith before the General Convention of 1785,—and he will scarcely deny that a Power more than human changed that body into what it became in 1789, only four years afterwards. None but the Almighty could have 'put the hook in the nose and the bridle in the lips, which turned us back by the way by which we came,'—back to the soundness we had before Calvin and Bucer and Martyr deprived us of it. Who would have imagined in 1788, that within one year our obscure and gasping churches would, in uniting, reclaim to themselves the catholic heritage which had been almost buried since the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. was superseded? Had any one so predicted, he would have been accounted a madman,—believing in that which neither argument nor cunning, neither force nor fraud, could effect: and the disparaging censure would have been just. Yet what to man's judgment was impossible, was actually brought to pass, and in an incredibly short time; so that in October 1789 our branch of the Church was by her liturgy as perfectly catholic, in the essentials of Catholicism, (the Athanasian Creed being, distinctly, a creed of corrollaries or consectaries,) as any branch of it had ever been, from the Apostles' age downwards. And he who ascribes this to 'craft and subtlety' derogates from the honor of the Omnipotent, even more atrociously than he slanders the true-hearted instruments by which He 'did these great things for us. Your

*August*, 1845. Old Friend.

---

For the Churchman.

Bishop Otey, in his Address to the Convention of the Diocese of Mississippi, of which he is Provisional Bishop, after recapitulating the measures adopted by the last General Convention, in reference to Dr. Hawks, the late Bishop elect of that Diocese, adds the following fact and comments:

"The Rev. Dr. Hawks has since been transferred to the Diocese of Louisiana, and it is understood that he left Mississippi with the determination not to permit his name again to be brought forward for the office of Bishop in your Diocese.

"It is for your body in its wisdom to decide what action, if any, it will take in the premises. I shall be pardoned, I hope, for expressing the opinion that the final action of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies was a shrinking from a responsibility which was fairly devolved upon it—or perhaps it would be more charitable and equally just to say that it was to get rid of a troublesome and annoying subject, and to throw back responsibility upon others, who were more deeply interested in the election of Dr. Hawks than the members of that House, but whose opportunities for examining into the particular objections raised against him, were necessarily limited and imperfect. *There* was the place and *then* was the time, where and when a full and final decision should have been made about this matter. The Diocese of Mississippi might elect to the Episcopate time and again, under the same circumstances, and the election must of necessity be confirmed by the House of Deputies or by those bodies which represent them for this purpose, in the recess of the General Convention, viz: the Standing Committees. The course of the House was objectionable I think, because the Constitution and Canons do not provide for any such course of proceeding, and because especially such a course of action is calculated to embarrass and dishearten a weak and infant Diocese."—*Calendar.*

*Mr. Editor,*—I am surprised that a gentleman who has the reputation of understanding our ecclesiastical system so well as Bishop Otey, should accuse the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the last General Convention, of dereliction of duty for not having investigated and pronounced judgment upon the charges brought against the Rev. Dr. Hawks, when his case was before them as Bishop elect of Mississippi. That House is not a judicial body. As representing the Dioceses of the American Church, its consent was necessary in order to the consecration of the Bishop elect. Like all other parties whose concurrence is required for so solemn and momentous an event, it might withhold that concurrence without assigning any reason. The Deputation from Mississippi brought the gentleman above named before the House as the Bishop elect of that Diocese, asking its recommendation of him for consecration. Charges were brought against him from the most respectable quarters, which, if true, were abundant proof of moral unfitness for the Episcopate. But they also, of course, affected his Christian and clerical character; matters on which the House could not sit in judgment. That belonged exclusively to the Diocese of Mississippi. It was competent to the deputation from that Diocese to withdraw the nomination. This they did not do. I see not, therefore, how the House could do otherwise than it did, that is, say to the Diocese of Mississippi, your Bishop elect comes before us as one not of good report. We, therefore, cannot now recommend him for the Episcopate. Neither are we competent to try him. You only can do that. You only can prove whether his evil report is with or without foundation. Take him back and settle this point. Then the authorities of the General Church can act on the case understandingly, should it again be brought before them. The only alternative would be the harsher one of voting down, by a direct negative, a resolution to recommend him for consecration. At least so thinks a friend to the

Right.

---

For the Churchman.

*Mr. Editor,*—The slender title which the Episcopal Recorder has to credit for its statements, where the purposes of its party are to be answered, may possibly not be generally known. It may, therefore, receive unmerited belief in its repeated reckless assertions that this Diocese has of late pursued the policy of not electing Trustees of the General Theological Seminary; and that this course has been adopted in order that its representatives, holding over according to the Constitution, shall not be exposed to the question of confirmation by the General Convention. These assertions are, of course, not true. New York has regularly chosen its Trustees, and reported them to the General Convention at *every meeting* of that body, since the adoption, in 1821, of the present Constitution of the Seminary, except at the meetings in 1826, and 1844.

In 1822 the first year for electing Trustees under the Constitution New York chose them by ballot. Since then the custom has been to re-elect such Trustees as were in office at the time and elect others to make up the constitutional compliment for the Diocese, and nominate them all, *old and new*, for confirmation by the General Convention; the election in the Diocesan Convention being *viva voce*, on nomination.

Why there was no election in 1826, I do not know.

In 1844, *let it be distinctly noted*, Bishop Onderdonk's friends urged that fairest and most impartial mode, *an election by by ballot.* It was warmly, indeed *passionately* opposed by his enemies. They did not want to lose their places, which some of them most assuredly would have done, had the Diocese been allowed to speak its mind freely. Our not having an election was *a yielding to the importunity of Low Churchmen*, who wished *to trammel free action.*

Will the Recorder have the honesty to tell its readers *the truth* on this subject?

## The Churchman.

New York: Saturday, August 30, 1845.

"Delenda est Carthago!" "New York must be destroyed!" is the motto of a certain party in the Church at this time. Her clergy, her laity, her principles, her institutions, are the objects of bitter enmity and furious assault. A Deacon has been persecuted to death, and her Bishop suspended; but these triumphs only whet the appetite for more victims. She has great influence in the conducting and management of the General Theological Seminary; she has contributed the greater part of its funds; the institution is situated within her limits; by the Constitution she has the right to a larger number of Trustees than any other diocese; and her weight in the Board of Trustees is therefore very considerable. Though Bishop Hobart has for many years gone to his rest, the influence of his mighty mind and far reaching vision still operates, and will continue to operate for an unlimited period; by his energy, determination, and wisdom, in a very eminent degree, its present Constitution was given to the General Theological Seminary, and the distinguishing features were impressed upon it, by which the *ratio of representation* is regulated. It is natural that those, who fiercely assailed him when living, should now seek to destroy one of the proudest monuments of his foresight and genius, and cry 'Down with it, down with it, even to the ground." It is due to New York to assert and vindicate her rights, when they are wickedly assailed without regard to truth, justice, or decency; and as threats of a portentous character have been fulminated forth by a weekly paper in a neighboring city which, despicable in themselves, seem to denote that a foul and deep conspiracy is concocting here for the worst objects, we call the attention of the Diocese to the fact, and shall proceed to give a brief statement of the interests which are at stake in this matter.

Our correspondent "Conservative" in our paper of August 2, stated some important facts, and we refer to his article in connexion with this. The Banner of the Cross also (August 16) had a most candid and able article on New York influence. We feel however that it is essential to go back to the first proposition for the establishment of a General Theological Seminary, and show step by step the action of the General Convention and that of the Diocese of New York in relation to the subject, until a compromise was happily effected. And let not the reader who loves the Church, regard the long statement of dates and facts as uninteresting and useless. They are, as we conceive, indispensably necessary to the full understanding of the subject; and to a clear exhibition of the Vested Rights which the Diocese enjoys in the General Theological Seminary, secured not only by the laws of the land but by the plighted faith of the Church in General Convention assembled. These are the rights which our enemies, could they have their way, would ruthlessly strike down and trample under foot.

The question was first agitated in the General Convention of 1814, but was laid over to the next Convention in order to obtain the views of the several dioceses.

Formal measures were taken in the General Convention of 1817. On May 26, the following Resolutions were passed in the House of Bishops, and subsequently concurred in by the House:—

*Resolved,* That it is expedient to establish, for the better education of the candidates for Holy Orders in this Church, a General Theological Seminary, which may have the united support of the whole Church in these United States, and be under the superintendence and control of the General Convention.

*Resolved,* That this Seminary be located in the city of New York.

A Committee of three were appointed to solicit contributions; and another Committee, consisting of the Presiding Bishop, and the Bishops of New York and New Jersey, with three clergymen and three laymen appointed by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, were empowered to receive and manage the funds collected,—to devise a plan for establishing and carrying into operation the institution, which plan was to be communicated to the several Bishops,—and sufficient funds being obtained, and the majority of the Bishops having approved the plan, to carry it into immediate operation.

The Committee, at a meeting held in Philadelphia, October 9, 1818, passed Resolutions—instituting certain Professorships; appointed Rev. Samuel F. Jarvis, Professor of *Biblical Learning;* and Rev. Samuel H. Turner, Professor of *Historic Theology;* and provided for the collection of funds, &c.

The Seminary accordingly went into operation. At the next General Convention held in May, 1820, it was Resolved that the Seminary should be transferred to and located in the city of New Haven, in the diocese of Connecticut. A Board of Trustees was appointed, consisting of the Bishops and twelve clergymen and twelve laymen: and among other things it was provided, that *those subscribers who had not paid, were not bound to pay their subscriptions unless they thought proper, the Seminary being removed to a different city.* So careful was the Church to preserve her faith.

In pursuance of this resolution, the Seminary was moved to New Haven. The Trustees formed a plan in July for its proper organization; and on the 7th of September in the same year it was opened. Rev. Professor Turner was then the sole Professor. In July, 1821, Rev. Bird Wilson was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology; funds having been specially contributed towards that object.

Let us now turn our attention to the action of the Diocese of New York.

Bishop Hobart, before his elevation to the Episcopate, had formed the design of a Theological School. In 1813 he first mentioned the subject officially, in his annual address. In 1814 he referred to the action of the General Convention already stated. In 1817 he warmly commended the proposed school to the people of his charge, and again in 1818, as beneficial to the Church at large, *and especially to the Diocese.* The Seminary having been moved to New Haven, he in July, 1820, put forth a Pastoral Address on the right of the Diocese of New York to found a Theological School for itself; and in his Annual Address in October of the same year, before the Convention, he dwelt at great length on the same subject. The whole of this part of the address deserves to be carefully studied. He sets forth the *extent of the resources*, and the *pre-eminence of the advantages* the Diocese enjoyed; the *donation of sixty-two lots of land* for the benefit of a Theological School; the duty of the Church in the Diocese to apply her resources in a way in which she would *have the reasonable control of them, and objected on this ground to the organization of the Seminary*: set forth in a masterly manner the advantages of the city of New York in a literary and ecclesiastical point of view; and urged with the utmost earnestness the immediate formation of a Diocesan School.

A Committee was forthwith appointed to prepare a plan, who reported, the next day, the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Education Society for the State of New York; which was adopted by the Convention.

The Trustees met on Oct. 27th, adopted By-Laws, and appointed a Board of Managers. The Board of Managers appointed in virtue thereof proceeded to systematize a plan, and in May following appointed Professors—Bishop Hobart, of Systematic Divinity and Pastoral Theology, Mr. C. C. Moore, of Biblical Learning, Mr. G. C. Verplanck, of the Evidences of Revealed Religion, and Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, of the Nature, Polity, and Ministry of the Church. A branch school at Geneva was also established, Rev. D. McDonald, J. Reed, and Orin Clark being the Professors.

Thus there were two distinct Seminaries in operation; one General, at New Haven; the other local, under the authority of the Diocese of New York.

Mr. Jacob Sherred, of New York city, by will will, dated Jan. 28th, 1820, bequeathed certain parts of his estate to his Executors in trust to invest the same, &c. "until there shall be established, *within the State of New York*, under the direction or by the authority of the General Convention of the P. E. Church in the U. S. of America, or of the Convention of the P. E. Church in the State of New York, a college, academy, school, or seminary for the education of young men designed for Holy Orders in the P. E. Church in the United States of America; and upon such college, &c., being so established, then upon the further trust that they do and shall pay or transfer, &c. to the Trustees," &c.

Mr. Sherred died the 28th of March, 1821.

At the time of his death there was not a Seminary *within the State of New York* under the direction or authority of the General Convention, but there was one under that of the Convention of New York, and therefore the latter claimed the legacy. But though it was confessed that the General Seminary, while it continued at New Haven, could not take the bequest, it was contended that if it removed to New York and was *established* there, then it would be entitled to take in preference to the New York Seminary, and that the right of the latter would be divested thereby.

A special General Convention was summoned to take into consideration this will of Mr. Sherred, to meet on the 30th October, 1821.

The New York Convention met Oct. 16th, 1821, and Bishop Hobart devoted a large portion of his address to this subject. After giving an account of the state of the school, its prosperity, the advantages of the location, and the duty of the Diocese to support it, he introduces the mention of the bequest of Mr. Sherred as putting the success of the school beyond all hazard: states that while the legal opinions in favor of the New York claim had been very strong, it was understood that no legal gentleman consulted in behalf of the General Seminary, had given a decided opinion in its favor,—shows the improbability of the General Convention establishing a distinct Seminary in the Diocese, and proceeds to consider the question of a union of the two schools. He states the objections of the possibility of its future removal, and that it might be under the control of a very small minority of the Church at large, and even of those who had not contributed, or in a very small proportion, to its funds; and considers the union as advisable "on principles which will secure all the essential arrangements with regard to our theological schools, and the just influence of those parts of the Church who may contribute to the general institution in its concerns."—(page 20-25.)

A Committee having been appointed on this part of the Bishop's address reported the next day, which report was accepted, and the following resolution passed, among others:—

*Resolved*, That this Convention will concur in any proper plan for consolidating the said seminary with any seminary for the like purpose, which the General Convention may, in its wisdom, see fit to establish, and *permanently fix*, within this Diocese, all the essential provisions and regulations of the Seminary now established, under the authority of the Convention of this State, being preserved, and a just influence in the management and control of the general institution being secured to each diocese within which contributions may be obtained, or donations made towards its funds. Provided, that the terms of such consolidation be approved by the Bishop of this Diocese, and the Clerical and Lay Deputies from the Convention of the Church in this State, to the approaching special General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States; and that those terms be submitted to and also approved by the Trustees of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Education Society in the State of New York, or the Board of Managers acting under their authority.—(p. 69.)

We refer our readers for further information to the Journal of 1821, where they will find the address, legal opinions, and other documents at full length.

The General Convention met Oct. 30th, 1821, in Philadelphia, and proceeded to consider and determine this exciting subject.

The various documents were referred to a Committee of both Houses, Bishops Hobart and Kemp, and Messrs. Cameron and Harison, Col. A. Jones, Rev. Messrs. Burhans, Butler, Wharton and Gadsden, who reported the present Constitution of the General Theological Seminary which was adopted "with singular unanimity."

This Constitution, *among other provisions*, declares that the Institution shall be *permanently established in the State of New York*:—each Diocese is entitled to one Trustee; one additional Trustee for every eight clergymen in the same; one additional Trustee for every $2000 contributed until the same amounts to $10,000; and one additional Trustee for every $10,000 of contributions and donations as aforesaid, exceeding that sum.

These provisions were inserted in accordance with the resolution of the New York Diocese; they were part of the fundamental compact on which the present Seminary was organized and established; by them especially "were the essential regulations of the Diocesan Seminary preserved, and a just influence secured to the Diocese." Witness the following preamble and resolutions passed in 1822 by the New York Convention:—

The Bishop having informed the Convention that the consolidation of the Theological Seminaries had taken place *in conformity with the conditions* contained in the resolution on that subject passed the last Convention.

Thereupon, *Resolved*, That agreeably to the pledge already given, this Convention do concur in the same, and cordially recommend the Theological Seminary, as now constituted by the General Convention, to the patronage of the Episcopalians of this Diocese.

The Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, thus constituted, met Dec. 19, 1821, and among other things, resolved that the Standing Committee be authorized to apply to the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation, which act was passed April 5, 1822.

By this consolidation New York yielded up her claim to the Sherred legacy, $60,000 at least, and her valuable real property, the gift of Mr. Moore, now worth twice that sum, besides other donations, in consideration of the permanent establishment of the Institution in this Diocese, and of having a *due influence* in the Board of Trustees. For the General Seminary there had been *subscribed* about $37,000, of which only a small part had come to the hands of the Treasurer. Some had been invested abroad, and some was in the hands of agents, and a part was never received: e. g. the contribution of North Carolina was estimated at $10,000; the amount actually paid up to 1844 was only $4,266. The whole amount contributed to Oct. 1844 is reported at $233,882 20, of which the Diocese of New York has contributed $176,353 11.

Such is a fair history, to the best of our knowledge and belief, formed on authentic printed documents, of the establishment of our General Theological Seminary; and such is the deep interest which New York has in its welfare and prosperity, and in the maintenance of its Constitution. And now we are told that she has too great power, that the Constitution must be altered, her property confiscated, and the Institution removed to a happier clime, (we can guess where.) The only question is, How are these nefarious projects to be effected? At first we were told by the Church—the General Convention. But the Church, it is found, will do nothing of the kind; she has respect for the laws of morality and honesty; and will keep her own hands and those of her children from picking and stealing. And even if the General Convention were to alter the Constitution, it would be of no avail without the consent of the Board of Trustees, and how can that consent be obtained? Not only would the Trustees of New York stand true *almost* to a man, and those of her Western sister be arrayed with them, but they would have the representatives of Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, several from South Carolina, a large number from Pennsylvania, and many from the various smaller dioceses, declaring with loud and unfaltering voice, *The faith of the Church pledged in General Convention must and shall be preserved.* The idea of a change from this quarter is preposterous.

New York must be punished! Let us get the House of Bishops to reject her nominations. Nonsense! In spite of late developments we still have confidence in the *House* of Bishops, and cannot believe that a *majority* of them would be induced by considerations of faction or malignity to commit so great a wrong. But suppose they did—what then? Why the present incumbents hold their places till their successors are *appointed*, not *nominated*, and this act of malice and vindictiveness, allowing it could be committed, (which of course is impossible,) would only make its perpetrators ridiculous.

New York must be punished! Let us go to the Legislature and get a repeal of the Charter; let every body go—"Anti-Puseyite," Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Unitarian, and every other name which is or can be named—hie to Albany and get a repeal. Fine pickings—$20,000 cash—62 lots of land, and water lots filled or to be filled in—commodious buildings—plenty of books, some very valuable—and a Professorship Endowment, which the "liberal donor wishes at the bottom of the sea;" and of course will gladly transfer to your pockets. Now do you understand! all to be had merely by asking.

A fine opinion the mover of this proposition must have of the morality and decency of "other denominations!" "Anti-Puseyites" of course he is well acquainted with.

We are confident that the respectable members of "other denominations" will abstain from meddling with an institution with which they have no concern, and leave Episcopalians to settle their own quarrels undisturbed by foreign interference.

And by way of cooling the ardor of "Anti-Puseyites" in their Quixotical enterprise it may be as well to suggest, that the repeal of the Act would only take away *corporate privileges*, but could not touch the *vested rights* of New York, nor *alienate the property*, and that in this case "the *spoils*" would not "belong to the victors."

Now, quoth his Editorship, we have you—the legislature can repeal or modify the act,—and the donors made their donations "*this clause staring them in the face.*" We see only ignorance and impudence staring us in the face, and sick enough they make us. How Mr. Moore, or Mr. Sherred in 1820, or the New York Convention in 1821, could see a clause passed in April, 1822, passes our comprehension. Look at facts and dates, gentle reader, and then say what terms ought to be applied to an individual, who advocates the destruction of the Seminary on such a ground as this.

Still, as there is no telling how far the spirit of opposition and phrensy may go, or what effects it may produce, if unchecked and unguarded against, it becomes the duty of the Diocese of New York to watch carefully her interests in this matter, and take good heed "ne quid detrimenti respublica capiat."

---

A correspondent, to whom we are indebted for his kindness, calls our attention to the following quotation from one of a series of "Essays on Episcopacy," by the Rev. Albert Barnes, now republishing in the Christian Observer, the organ of the New School Presbyterians.

"These persons [i. e. a certain class of Low Churchmen] are often grieved with many things in the Prayer Book, and particularly with the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We have understood that some of the Evangelical Ministers of the Episcopal Church are so much troubled with the portion of the Prayer Book that relates to Baptism, that they *omit* that part which obviously teaches the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration."—(*See Ch. Observer, Aug. 15, 2d column of 1st page, 44th line from top.*

We have not the paper by us, but presume the quotation is correct. We are sorry Mr. Barnes should advance so grave a charge against the whole body of Low Church clergy on a mere *understanding*; for of course, unless names are given, they are all involved. Without the clearest evidence we cannot believe that any clergyman could be so forgetful of his duty as to mutilate the Baptismal Service. We should be obliged to Mr. Barnes, therefore, to favor us either publicly or privately with the *names* of those who have done this: and if any of our readers or correspondents are cognizant of them, we ask for immediate information.

---

WESTERN NEW YORK.—We learn from the "Rochester Democrat" and "Daily Advertiser," that the Convention of this Diocese was held in St. Paul's church, in that city, on Wednesday and Thursday of last week. We are happy to find that Bishop DeLancey was well enough to preside during the whole session, and that he delivered a very able and interesting address.

After the Bishop had delivered his annual address on the first day of the Convention,—On motion of W. C. Pierpoint, seconded by Ex. Lieut. Gov. Tracy, the following was offered—

Whereas, it has pleased the Giver of life, of health, and of safety, to restore the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of this Diocese to a good measure of his former strength, after the sudden and great dangers which befel him on the 16th day of May last, so that he is now again among us in the almost complete discharge of his sacred and indispensable functions, therefore

*Resolved*, That this Convention cannot proceed to their regular business, without first placing upon their records their grateful sense of the wonderful goodness manifested to the Church by its Divine Ruler, and their fervent prayer that this great mercy may be prefected in the entire recovery of their beloved Bishop, and in the more humble, holy, and obedient devotion of all the members of the Diocese, to the glory of God and the edification of the Church.

Carried unanimously.

The chief proceeding of interest appears to have been a resolution introduced by Judge Dayton, of Lockport, to the effect that the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary for that Diocese be instructed to use all proper efforts to procure a special meeting of the Board of Trustees to consider and act upon the removal of the Professor of the Nature, Ministry and Polity of the Church from his office!—This absurd Catalinian resolution gave rise to a long and free debate; the chief speakers were the Judge in favor, and Rev. Mr. Van Ingen and the Hon. Speaker Seymour against, both of whom highly distinguished themselves. We are particularly gratified with the noble stand and magnanimous sentiments of the Hon. Mr. Seymour. The question was unanimously postponed to the next Convention, i. e. indefinitely; of course merely out of courtesy to the mover, and to save him the mortification of an overwhelming defeat on a direct vote; this was over-courteous.

We have also received (too late for insertion) an interesting communication from a member of the Convention. We return our hearty thanks and shall give it in our next.

---

THE CAREY MONUMENT.—We insert a part of a communication *purporting* to be a defence of the Emmanuel Free Church. Not knowing the author we had intended to lay it aside, but being informed that it comes from a respectable source, we publish it as requested.

"Since the appearance of J. H. H.'s virulent attack on this congregation, I have endeavored to investigate the affair. The Rector is not in the city, but I have been informed by one of the vestrymen, that the tablet had been removed without his knowledge, or his consent having been asked; and that the consent of the junior warden, and a vestrymen of the Annunciation Church had been obtained. It is denied that the removal was demanded before "another Sunday. There were not *three* individuals in the parish who knew of the removal until they saw the vacant space, besides those who assisted in taking it down. The reasons given to me for this step were these, and to every candid mind they must be sufficient excuse for the proceeding. First, the tablet had been the cause of frequent mistakes. Some thought Emmanuel Church was associated with the Church of the Annunciation; some, after reading the inscription, declined to take a seat in a 'Puseyite Church'—and while I am 'mindful of human frailty' I am mortified to say, that *many* who came to worship there, *left the House of God* with these impressions; others who had heard that the tablet was still to be seen there, would not join with us on that account in the services of the Church. Is it *surprising* that a *very* few among so many, who were very anxious for the prosperity of the parish, should wish to remove an object which had been the cause of so much unpleasant feeling and remark? I am informed that the Rector, who was a fellow student, and ordained on the same memorable day that the Rev. A. Carey was, felt much grieved when he saw what had been done during his absence, and that he called on the Editor of the Churchman to assure him that no disrespect had been intended or *felt* to the memory of the dead, and that Dr. Seabury appeared to be satisfied with the explanation he made. I am told that the Senior Warden expresses the same feelings, and the members of the vestry and congregation generally. I see no reason, therefore, to suppose that any one had the least intention of giving pain to the afflicted friends of the lamented Carey, or doing dishonor to his memory, or to gratify *party malignity*, for there seems to be a *total absence* of party feeling, and it appears evidently that the wish was simply to remove a cause of offence, the effects not being taken into consideration.

"I have seen and heard nothing to justify the charge of 'feelings of baffled vengeance towards the decomposing dust,' or of 'effervescence of passion.' For my own part, (and many have expressed the same feelings,) it would have been pleasing to have retained some memorial of one I esteemed in life, and whose memory I revere as a devoted servant of Christ; for though opposed to *some* of his *opinions*, I believed with J. H. H. that 'he had lost his way in *elevations* and labyrinths of thought,' yet that 'he was endowed with that holiness which through Christ is a sure passport to the presence of God.' There have been some of late among the worshippers in that holy temple, who have dropped the tear and heaved the sigh of regret to his memory, while they loved to dwell on the thought that he had ever ministered at that sacred altar. I hope, Rev. Sir, that neither your readers nor yourself agree with J. H. H. in thinking that this people would ruthlessly violate the sanctity of private grief, or 'hyena like' tear the relics of the sainted dead from any resting place. I agree with him in one particular. 'We have had enough of rancor and contention in the Church,' and I call upon him, and upon you, and upon all who have the welfare of the Church of Christ at heart, to combine with me to put down *party spirit*. Denunciation, and bitterness, and wrath will not, *cannot* effect this, but the Spirit of God alone. TRUTH."

"*New York, August 25, 1845.*"

The above, in many of the most important points, fully substantiates J. H. H.'s statements. It appears that some persons *could not worship there because of the tablet, and that to conciliate them* it was torn down! The *vestry* did not authorize it—pray then who did? Who exercises such paramount authority in the Emmanuel Free Church as to dare to perpetrate this act without special leave? Suppose the Rector and Congregation of the Church of the Annunciation are satisfied (*which for very good reasons we do not believe*) has the Church at large, has religion, has humanity nothing to say in the matter? We hate "party spirit" as much as the writer of the communication, and therefore shall examine strictly into this affair, that full justice may be done to all.

Since penning the above we have read an article in this (Wednesday) evening's Commercial which, much as it is praised, is the most lame and impotent defence we have ever seen. The author vouches for nothing, but "is informed" and "has heard" no agreement was made. Very well—we shall see about that.

In the communication occurs the following sentence:—

"Is it then surprising, Messrs. Editors, that *some in this infant parish felt anxious that an object which seemed to be an hindrance to many, should be removed from those walls,*" *&c.* The very *gist* of the charge is here admitted. We must, however, leave the subject for the present.

We return our thanks to the several publishers of the following works, received since our last.

INDICATOR, P. 2, by LEIGH HUNT.

This is the 20th number of Wiley & Putnam's beautiful Library of Choice Reading, noticed in our last.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY, No. 10. Harper & Brothers.

Housekeepers should study the article on "Washing."

CYCLOPAEDIA *of Practical Receipts*, No 2. D. Appleton & Co.

In addition to the intrinsic value of this work, the alphabetical arrangement makes it exceedingly convenient for reference.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, No. 67.

Contains among other articles an interesting account of the Rev. Dr. Wolff's Mission to Bokhara from the New Quarterly Review.

A TREATISE *on Domestic Economy*, by Miss C. E. BEECHER. Harper & Brothers. Third edition.

This book appears to correspond to its title very fully, and to give very useful advice and directions on the numerous subjects of which it treats in connexion therewith. If young ladies are deficient in knowledge on these points, it will not be the fault of the accomplished authoress.

MEDICI SERIES OF ITALIAN PROSE. Translated and edited by C. EDWARDS LESTER. Paine & Burgess.

1. Challenge of Barletta—a spirited translation of an Italian Romance "of the olden time."

2 and 3. Machiavelli's Florentine Histories.

We hail with great gratification this translation of a valuable historical work, and hope it will meet with an extensive sale and diligent perusal. Italian history of that early period is little known by us; and it merits particular attention as exhibiting, on a small scale it is true, the workings and strifes of the aristocratical and democratical principles. This series is very well executed as to typography.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES *on Modern History by* DR. ARNOLD. D. Appleton & Co.

Coming from the pen of so distinguished an author these lectures must of course be able, profound, and fraught with important suggestions and information. Unfortunately the author's singular and pernicious Church principles meet us at many a turn, and it is necessary emphatically to warn the Churchman against them. In the "True Catholic" of this month, there is a valuable article on the Life and Views of Dr. Arnold, which every one should read who desires to have correct ideas on the subject. Professor Reed's notes appear to enhance the value of the book, which is more than can be said generally of Cis-Atlantic Editors. The work is got up in very handsome style by the publishers.

HISTORY OF IRELAND, No. 6. Sadlier's edition.

TREASURY OF HISTORY, No. 8. Daniel Adee.

---

ANGLO-AMERICAN FREE CHURCH.—It will be perceived by the Advertisement in another column that the Services of this Church will (D. V.) be commenced on Sunday next in the Minerva room, which has been engaged for that purpose. We are most happy to find that by the efforts made the enterprise has attained this stage of maturity, and trust that every one calling himself a Churchman will lend his aid and support, according to his ability, to this benevolent object—the keeping within our own fold those who belong to our Holy Mother, and who would be drawn off into strange pastures but for some such special provision.

## To Correspondents.

I. K. E. seeks to exculpate the many at the expense of one—the communication being anonymous and the author unknown, we cannot insert it. Any statement, official or semi-official, will of course be received, if suitable for our columns.

It will be observed that one of the communications published is without a signature. We wish our correspondents invariably to use one for future identification and reference.

## Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church,

*Residing in the Cities of New York and Brooklyn, with their respective residences.*

Onderdonk, D.D., Rt. Rev. Benjamin T., 106 Franklin.
Abercrombie, Rev. R. M., 359 Fourth st., and 3, 129 st.
Anthon, D.D., Rev. Henry, 2d Avenue, cor. of 10th st.
Balch, Rev. Lewis P. W., 4 Great Jones.
Bedell, Rev. G. T., corner Tenth st. and Fifth avenue.
Benton, Rev. George, 34 Perry street.
Berrian, D.D., Rev. William, 50 Varick.
Bradin, Rev. James W., 292 Henry street.
Carder, Rev. J. D., Fort Hamilton, New York Harbor.
Cruse, D. D., Rev. Christian F., 21 First avenue.
Dowdney, Rev. John, Fourth avenue, between 24th and 25th streets, and 20 John street.
Evans, Rev. Benjamin, 172 Broome street.
Forbes, Rev. John M., 477 Hudson.
Frazer, Rev. Alexander, 168 Grand street.
Grigg, Rev. John, 93 Ninth avenue.
Hackley, D.D., Rev. Charles W., 3 College Green.
Haight, Rev. Benjamin I., 3 Rutger's Place.
Harris, Rev. Nathaniel S., 281 Broadway.
Hawley, Rev. Fletcher J., 9th Av. betw. 22d and 23d st.
Heyer, Rev. Wm. Grant, 457 Bowery, cor. Ninth st.
Higbee, D.D., Rev. Edward Y., 159 Chambers.
Hoyt, Rev. R., 213 Green street.
Huddart, Rev. R. Townsend, 14th street.
Irving, Rev. Pierre P. 281 Broadway.
Jackson, Rev. C. D., 20 John st., and Rossville, L. I.
Jones, Rev. Lot, 77 Second avenue.
Labagh, Rev. I. P., Gravesend, L. I., or 281 Broadway.
Lyell, D.D., Rev. Thomas, 77 Anthony.
Marcus, Rev. Moses, cor. of Lexington av. and 27th st.
McVickar, D.D., Rev. John, 8 College Green.
Mead, Rev. Edward N., 103 Amity street.
Millett, Rev. James, 31 Irving Place.
Morris, Rev. William, 76 Varick.
Nichols, Rev. Edwin A., 528 Hudson st.
Ogilby, D. D., Rev. John D., Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth street.
Pardee, Rev. Isaac, 18 St. Mark's Place.
Parker, Rev. B. C. C., 114 East Broadway, cor. Pike.
Peck, Rev. Isaac, 23 Wooster street.
Pound, Rev. Jesse, 50 Fourth street.
Price, Rev. Joseph Henry, 62 Second avenue.
Richmond, Rev. William, Bloomingdale.
Seabury, D.D., Rev. Samuel, 471 Hudson.
Shimeall, Rev. Richard C., 185 Fourth street.
Smith, D.D., Rev. Hugh, 206 Twentieth, next to St. Peter's Church.
Spencer, Rev. Jesse A., 208 Wooster street.
Southard, Rev. Samuel L., 26th near Lexington av.
Taylor, Rev. Fitch W., U. S. N., 697 Broadway.
Taylor, D.D., Rev. Thomas H., 1 Rector st.
Thayer, Rev. F., 239 Eighth avenue.
Turner, D.D., Rev. Samuel H., Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth.
Tyng, D. D., Rev. Stephen H., 82 Beekman st.
Verren, Rev. Antoine, 99 Franklin st.
Wainwright, D.D., Rev. Jonathan M., 10 Hubert.
Walton, Rev. W., 2 Abingdon square.
Whitehouse, D. D., Rev. H. J., 120 Eleventh street.
Williamson, Rev. C. H., 72 Murray street.
Wilson, D.D. Rev. Bird, Theological Seminary, Chelsea square, Twentieth st.

### Brooklyn.

Bancroft, Rev. Charles, 1 Sand street.
Blake, D.D., Rev. John L., 3 Cornell Place, Clinton st.
Carter, Rev. Lawson, Smith st., corner of Livingston.
Cutler, D.D., Benjamin C., 1 Sands street.
Diller, Rev. J. W., Washington av., near Fulton av.
Henry, D.D., Rev. Caleb S., 55 Johnson street.
Hunter, Rev. Joseph, Classon avenue.
Johnson, Rev. Evan M., corner of Pearl and Johnson.
Lewis, Rev. William H., Pierrepont, near Fulton.
Messenger, Rev. John F., Pacific st., near Clinton st.
Stone, D.D., Rev. John S., next door to Christ Church.
Vinton, Rev. Francis, Court st., between Schermerhorn and Livingston sts.

### Williamsburgh.

Clapp, Rev. Caleb, 3 South Third street.
Haskins, Rev. Samuel M., 1 St. Mark's Place.

### Jersey City, N. J.

Barry, D.D., Rev. Edmund D., Essex street.
Patterson, Rev. A. C., Grand street.

## Clerical Changes.

The Rev. Samuel Cooke, of Geneva, New York, has accepted the unanimous call of the parish of St. Paul's church, New Haven, Conn., to become their rector, and will enter upon his duties early in November next.

The Rev. Henry Townsend having resigned the parish of St. James's Church, New Haven, (Westville,) Conn., and removed to Stockport, Columbia co., N. Y., requests that all letters and papers designed for him be directed to the latter place.

The Rev. Alfred Louderback has resigned the charge of Zion church, Greene, Chenango co., Western N. Y., and accepted the Missionary station of Rockford, Winnebago co., and Belvidere, Boone co., Illinois. He requests that all papers, letters, and communications for him be addressed to *Belvidere, Boone, co., Illinois.*

The Rev. Phineas Smith, who has been a Presbyterian clergyman for the last eighteen years, has become a candidate for orders in the Diocese of Michigan. The friend from whom we have received this intelligence writes thus:—

"No one had quite so much influence in effecting this change as Dr. Potts, in his controversy with Dr. Wainwright. Mr. Smith always believed in the necessity of an apostolical succession in the ministry, and believed that Presbyterians both held to such a succession and had it. The congregational and latitudinarian ground taken then by Dr. Potts, was surprising and shocking to Mr. S. He was led to a serious and prayerful examination of the subject; such an examination has resulted in his becoming a most decided Churchman."—*Witness.*

Thank you, Dr. Potts.—*Ed. Ch.*

---

DIED—In Tremont, Tarcevell county, Illinois, on the 18th August, the Rev. WILLIAM DOUGLASS, the Missionary of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society at that station.

Being aware that his "departure was at hand," before "finishing his course" he gave abundant evidence that he had "kept the faith," and died rejoicing in the promises of the Gospel. May his soul rest in peace until "the last day," then to receive his perfect consummation in bliss, even the "*crown, of glory*," which the Lord, the righteous Judge shall then give to those who love him!

*Tremont, Aug. 18, 1845.* R. A. S.

## Married.

On Tuesday, 26th inst., at Christ church, Brooklyn, by the Rev. Dr. Stone, GEORGE FREDERICK TYLER and LOUISA RICHMOND, only daughter of Rev. John L. Blake, D.D.

## Died.

On the 24th inst., at his late residence at New Rochelle, West Chester co., the Rev. SAMUEL HASKELL, aged 83 years.

## Calendar.

### August.

31. Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

### September.

7. Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.
14. Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.
17.
19. } Ember-Days.
20.
21. Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity. St. Matthew the Apostle.
28. Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.
29. St. Michael and All Angels.

## Notices.

ANGLO-AMERICAN FREE CHURCH.—Divine service, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and with a view to the formation of an ANGLO-AMERICAN FREE CHURCH, *for the more immediate use and benefit of* BRITISH EMIGRANTS, will be held on Sunday next, the 31st, in the morning at 10½ o'clock, and in the afternoon at 3½ o'clock, in the large and commodious Room of the MINERVA, No. 406 Broadway.

SEATS FREE.—The attendance of all persons interested in the success of the undertaking, as well as of English Residents, and British Emigrants with their families, is hereby very earnestly requested.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the Annual Meeting of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, will be held on Tuesday, September 23d, in the Sunday School Room of St. John's Chapel, at 5 o'clock, P. M.

Aug. 26—4t JOSEPH HUNTER, Sec'y.

☞ The next Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Ohio, will be held in Christ church, Cincinnati, on Thursday, the 11th of September, 1845. JOSEPH MUENSCHER, Sec'y.

### Diocesan Convention.

Notice is hereby given that the ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Protestant Episcopal Church in THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK, will assemble in ST. JOHN'S CHAPEL, in the City of New York, on WEDNESDAY THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER next, at TEN O'CLOCK in the morning. BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT, Sec'y.

New York, August 20, 1845.

☞ In accordance with Section 5 of Canon I, the Secretary appends to the foregoing notice, a copy of Section 4 of the same Canon, as follows:—

"The appointment of a Lay Deputy to the Convention of this Diocese shall be certified in writing by the Rector of the parish of which he is a representative, or by one of the Wardens, or by the Clerk of the Vestry of such church: and no other certificate of the appointment of any Lay Deputy or Deputies to the Convention of this Diocese shall be allowed or received. And no Lay Delegate shall be entitled to a seat in the Convention unless he be entitled to vote for Wardens and Vestrymen of the Church which he is appointed to represent."

MISS SAGAR and MISS BALLOW will re-open their School for Young Ladies, at No. 10 Albion Place, Fourth st., on Monday, September 8.

MRS. OKILL, No. 8 and 10 Clinton Place, (8th street,) will be in readiness to receive her pupils on Tuesday, the 16th of September. Aug. 30—8t$

A LADY accustomed to teaching, wishes to engage as Governess in a private family; or as Companion to a Lady. A pleasant house is her first object, salary being a secondary consideration. Testimonials satisfactory. Address "A. D.," post paid, at this office. ☞ No objection to a Southern or Western residence. Aug. 9—3t

ST. MARK'S HALL, *Orange, Essex County, N. J.*, Rev. ANTHONY TEN BROECK, A. M., Rector.

The undersigned, with the approbation, and at the desire of the Bishop of the Diocese, is about to open an Institution for the instruction of boys. The pupils will be taught the various branches of a full course of English and Classical Studies; and the Institution will be conducted on the principles of Christian Education.

There will be two sessions, of five months each, in every year. The first session will begin on the 1st of November, and be followed by a vacation of one month. The second session will begin on the 1st of May.

For the accommodation of those who desire it, pupils will be received for the *opening session* as early as the 15th of Sept.

The charge *per session* is $100, payable in advance. This charge includes every thing but clothing, books, and medical attendance.

Orange is pleasantly situated about thirteen miles from New York, and four from Newark. It is easy of access ey the Morristown rail-road, which passes through it, and by stages from Newark. It is well known as a location favorable to health.

A large and convenient house has been secured for the present, which will afford every accommodation to a limited number of pupils. It is proposed to provide for a larger number, by the erection of suitable buildings for the permanent use of the Institution.

Communications, either to obtain further information, or to apply for admission of pupils, may be made to the subscriber, addressed—"St. Mark's Hall, Orange, Essex co., N. J."

August 30, 1845. ANTH. TEN BROECK.

## Acknowledgments.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.—Since his acknowledgment of the 20th of August, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From Christ ch, Newton, N J, $5; Ladies' Missionary Society of St John's ch, Portsmouth, N H, per Miss Mary Hardy, $25; Trinity ch, Easton, Pa, per Rev J M Rogers, $10; Zion ch, Pontiac, Mich, per Rev J A Wilson, $2; Christ ch, Rye, N Y, per Rev P S Chauncey, $27; Church of the Ascension, Frankfort, Ky, per Rev M H Hunter, $5 60; Zion ch, Greenburgh, N Y, $15; Christ ch, Tarrytown, $12 78; St Andrew's ch, Harlem, monthly collection, S S, for July, $1 28; do, con of the parish, $3 33. Total, $146 99.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
Aug. 27, 1845. 139 Broadway, New York.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee acknowledges the receipt of the following amounts for the two weeks, ending August, 27:

From Grace ch, Jamaica, L I, per Rev W L Johnson, $17 75; through Geo M Marsh, Esq, from Ladies' Missionary Association of St John's ch, Portsmouth, N H, $25. Total, $42 75.

J. SMYTH ROGERS, Treasurer,
New York, Aug. 27, 1845. 69 Wall-st.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sum, viz:—

From St Stephen's ch, Ridgefield, Ct, Rev T M Leavenworth, rector, $2 50.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, Aug. 27, 1845.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.—The treasurer thankfully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

From Zion ch, Greenburgh, Rev Wm Creighton, D D, rector, $15.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, Aug. 27, 1845.

MISSIONARY COMMITTEE OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.—The Treasurer has received since report of 9th ult., the following contributions, viz:—

From St James's ch, New York, Rev John Dowdney, rector, (from monthly offerings,) $9 14; St George's ch, Newburgh, Rev Dr Brown, rector, collection, $60. Total amount, $69 14.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer,
Aug. 27, 1845. 55 Water street.

FUND FOR AGED AND INFIRM CLERGYMEN.—The Treasurer of the Convention has received for the "Fund for Aged and Infirm Clergymen," the following contributions since acknowledgment of 7th May, viz:—

From Trinity ch, Windham, Rev T S Judd, $1 50; St John's ch, Johnstown, Rev C Jones, $3 07; Zion ch, Greenburgh, $12; and Christ ch, Tarrytown, Rev Dr Creighton, $16 14. Total amount, $32 71.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer
of the Convention of P. E. Church, N. Y.,
Aug. 27, 1845. 55 Water street.

We the undersigned do gratefully acknowledge the receipt of $10, through the hands of the Rev Richard Bury, rector of Trinity ch, Cleveland, Ohio; and $5 from M McDougal; also six copies of "Episcopacy Examined," and a parcel of Tracts from Thomas C Butler, the Treasurer and Agent of the Tract and Common Prayer Book Society.

JAMES LLOYD BRECK,
for the Nashotah Mission.
Nashotah Lakes, W. T., 25th July, 1845.

We the undersigned do gratefully acknowledge the receipt of 50 Norwegian Bibles, and 50 New Testaments in the same language, through Mr Winston of New York. GUSTAF UNONCUS.

Pine Lake, W. T., 1st Aug., 1845.

FREE CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY.—The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of $25, for the benefit of the poor, from "A Protestant Episcopalian," by the hands of T N Stanford, Esq.

LOT JONES, 77 Second Avenue.
New York, Aug. 22, 1845.

A LADY who has taught Music for eight years with much success, both in schools and in private families, wishes to increase her present number of pupils the ensuing fall. She would like to attend one or two schools in the city or its vicinity. Satisfactory references given. Cards of address may be obtained at this office. Aug. 23—$4t

INGLESIDE FEMALE SEMINARY—Rev. REUBEN RILEY, Rector; Mrs. EMILY GIBSON, Head of the Family.

This Institution will commence its first session on the first Monday in September next. The situation combines all that can render it pleasant, being one of the most healthy in the country, and only six miles from Baltimore. Applications must be made to the Rector, care of Dr. H. Colburn.

☞ Circulars may be had at Dr. Colburn's Bookstore, 174 Baltimore st., or D. Brunner's, No. 1 North Charles street. Aug. 23.

CLASSICAL AND ENGLISH SCHOOL, No. 208 Wooster, near Amity st., Rev. J. A. SPENCER, A. M., Rector.

This School will re-open on Monday, September 1st. The number of pupils is limited and select, in order that each boy may receive the personal care and supervision of the Rector, and be *thoroughly trained* in the various branches of English and Classical learning. Two or three boys can be received into the Rector's family.

REFERENCES.—Rev. Dr. Anthon, Rev. Dr. Taylor, Rev. Dr. McVickar, Rev. G. T. Bedell, Rev. L. P. W. Balch, Rev. J. M. Forbes, Rev. B. I. Haight, Prof. Chales Anthon, LL.D., Prof. James Renwick, LL.D., Dr. Edward Delafield, Dr. J. Stearns, Henry Wilkes, Esq., Geo. T. Strong, Esq.

☞ Circulars may be obtained at Appletons, 200 Broadway, Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway, Miller's, 645 Broadway, and at the Rector's residence.

Aug. 23—5t

SOUND EDUCATION IN PRIVATE.—Terms $400 per annum, payable half yearly in advance. No extra.

Mr. JAMES SUCH, formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge, (England,) and some time private tutor in that University, receives into his family ten pupils. The house is situated near Jamaica, Long Island, half an hour's ride by railroad from New York. The course of instruction is precisely similar to that pursued at the most reputable schools in England, such as Eton Harrow, Winchester and the Charter House—the same education as is given to the sons of the higher classes when they aspire to University honors and are designed for parliament, the bar, or the pulpit, with the addition, however, of a thorough knowledge of the French and Mathematics on the Cambridge plan. The discipline is altogether that of a private family; a discipline which can only obtain where the number is small. Religious instruction is strictly attended to. Mr. Such has been bred to the business of tuition. He is wholly devoted to his pupils, and undertakes no greater number than himself and his son can do strict justice by. He is well acquainted with the French language, having spoken it from childhood, and resided much in France when preceptor to a young nobleman. A father desirous of procuring for his son a healthy and comfortable residence, and at the same time sound education, whether for professional or commercial pursuits, would find this an opportunity seldom offering. Mr. Such's pupils have attained the highest honors at Harvard and Yale Colleges. His Seminary has been established eight years, and is known to the following gentlemen:—

Rt. Rev. Bishop Doane, New Jersey; Hon. and Rt. Rev. Bishop of Toronto, U. C.; Rt. Rev. Bishop Eastburn, Boston; Gov. Everett, Boston; Hon. Abbott Lawrence, Boston; Prof. Vethake, Philadelphia; Gen. P. B. Porter, Niagara Falls; Elias Vanderhorst, Charleston, S. C.; Rev. W. Shelton, Buffalo; Col. A. S. Jones, Georgia; Dr. R. Breckenridge, Baltimore; Rev. W. L. Johnson, Jamaica, L. I.

*In Washington.*—Hon. Ex-President Adams, Hon. Daniel Webster, Hon. Henry Clay, Hon. W. C. Preston, Hon. Waddy Thompson, Hon. Ogden Hoffman, Hon. John Sergeant, Hon. Augustus Porter.

*In New York.*—Ex-President Duer, Columbia College, Prof. Anthon, Rev. Dr. Wainwright, Hon. James Monroe, Henry D. Cruger, Esq., Dr. Bartlett, D. B. Fearing, Esq., Judge Edwards, T. B. Fearing, Esq., C. A. Davis, Esq., Reuben Withers, Esq., W. B. Astor, Esq., W. Edgar, Esq., General Scott, Benj. Silliman, Esq.

*In Harvard University.*—Hon. Josiah Quincy, President; Hon. Judge Story, Law Professor; C. C. Felton, Esq. Greek Prof.; Dr. C. Beck, Latin Prof.; B. Pierce, Mathematical Professor; Prof. Longfellow.

Aug. 23—13t$

MOUNT WASHINGTON COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, 43 West Washington Place, under the care of Messrs. HUBBS & CLARKE, will re-open on Thursday, the 4th day of September. Aug. 9—5t$

From the True Catholic.

## Birth-Day Thoughts.

*O dulces comitum valete cœtus,*
*Longe quos simul a domo profectos*
*Diverse variæ viæ reportant!*

Hopes, that tremble as ye rise,
Wishes, fainting while ye breathe,
Why tempt me, in angel-guise,
To leave the rugged path that lies
Your sun-lit course beneath?

Why call up in bright array
Visions of the pleasant past?
—Saddening with your sweet display
And making every present day
Less golden than the last.

Can ye always light the skies
With your rosy morning-gleam?
Or forbid a cloud to rise,
Blending with the purple dyes
Of your orient beam?

When my youth and manhood fail
Mid the shadows of the West,
Can ye gild the Evening pale,
That, throned in every sombre vale,
Holds empire o'er my breast?

If not—trembling Hopes, adieu—
Fainting Wishes, die away:—
—Rather let a calmer hue
Abide the test of Memory true
And deck the present Day!

---

From the English Churchman.

## Ronge, Czerski and the German-Catholic Church.

NO. IV.

The confession of the "German Catholic congregation" at Schneidemuhl, was put forth on the 19th of October, 1844. But, although it was extensively circulated, it did not appear likely to gain for the new party many adherents; it was too moderate; it retained too many points of resemblance to the creeds of the Romish Church. Ronge, however, had then just obtained his celebrity, and when he was excommunicated, and degraded from his priestly office, he determined to follow the example of Czerski, and gather around him a similar congregation at Breslau. As soon as this became known, an enthusiasm for the cause began to prevail; addresses to the new "Church" poured in from Protestants and Catholics; contributions of money were sent from all parts of Germany, while in many towns steps were immediately taken for forming congregations in communion with the new body. The confession of the faith of Ronge, and his congregation at Breslau, was, in the meanwhile, anxiously looked for. It appeared in February of the present year, and presented, as had been expected, very material deviations from that of Schneidemuhl, bearing the stamp of Ronge's character, as the latter did that of Czerski's. Ronge was evidently desirous of drawing up a creed so comprehensive as to admit all, whether Catholics, or Protestants, or schismatics of any shade or complexion, who might entertain doubts respecting any point of their own confessions of faith; and accordingly the first three Protestant clergymen who joined the new body, Ruprecht, Vogtherr, and Hoffrichter, did so expressly on the ground that the creeds of the Prussian "Evangelical Church" impose too great a restriction on liberty of conscience!

The confession of Breslau rejects all the existing creeds, and adopts the following in their place:—

"I believe in God the Father, who by his almighty word created the world, and governs it in wisdom, righteousness, and love. I believe in Jesus Christ, our Saviour, who by his doctrine, his life, and his death, has redeemed us from slavery and sin. I believe in the influence exercised by the Holy Ghost, (das Walten des heiligen Geistes) upon earth; in a holy, universal, Christian Church; remission of sins, and a life everlasting. Amen."

But even this creed is superfluous, inasmuch as the second article of the confession declares that "we maintain perfect liberty of conscience, and detest all constraint, all falsehood, and hypocrisy." The third article asserts the Holy Scriptures to be the only rule of faith; and the fourth, that "the interpretation thereof must not be limited by any external authority." The other articles acknowledge only two sacraments, retain Confirmation as a solemn admission into the Communion, recognise in the Lord's Supper a feast commemorative (Erinnerungsmahl) of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ; reject auricular confession, celibacy of priests, invocation of saints, reverence to relics and pictures, pilgrimages, indulgences, and fasting.

On the 9th of March the first service was performed at Breslau, in the chapel attached to the poor-house, which the magistrates had granted for the purpose. This solemn service commenced with a hymn (written for the occasion, and adapted to the air of a song which is very popular with German students.) addressed not to the Almighty God whom they had assembled to worship, not to the Holy Virgin or to any saint or martyr, but to the new Apostle himself, who stood before the altar and complacently suffered this honor to be paid to him.*

During the next few weeks German Catholic congregations were formed in many of the principal towns of Germany, and each adopted whichever creed was most agreeable. But the leaders of the movement were well aware that without unanimity they could not hope for success, and therefore convened a council, which assembled at Leipsig, on the 22d of March. Delegates were present from Leipsig, Breslau, Liegnitz, Schneidemuhl, Berlin, Nauen, Oschatz, Dahlen, Merseburg, Brunswick, Magdeburg, Genthin, Hildesheim, Dresden, Chemnitz, Penig, Zschopau, Annaberg, Elberfeld, and Offenbach. In addition to these, congregations have since been formed in twenty-six places in the province of Silesia alone, as well as in many important towns, such as Worms, Frankfort, Mayence, Halle, Dantzig, Stettin, and many others, which have all adopted the resolutions of the council held at Leipzig. These consisted chiefly in the adoption of the confession of Breslau, and in ordering a translation of the Bible to be made *on new principles*, under the superintendence of Ronge, Czerksi, and Kerbler, of which the first numbers have since been published.

These proceedings, however, instead of producing the desired unanimity, have been productive of a schism among themselves, which may prove fatal to the stability of the whole plan. The German Catholics at Berlin, like those at Elberfeld, had originally adopted the confession of Schneidemuhl; and after the council of Leipzig, all the copies of this confession were ordered to be destroyed, an order which was strictly obeyed. But soon dissatisfaction began to be loudly expressed, and at last a protest appeared in the public papers, signed by several members of the new congregation. A few extracts from this protest will show the relative position of the parties:—

"We protest against the confession adopted by the council held at Leipzig: we would accept the first article of the Creed, if in the second we found the Son, without whom it is impossible to have the Father in truth; but the second article says nothing of Jesus Christ, but the bare words that He is our Saviour." "If in the article of 'God the Father' a more accurate definition would be added, much more ought it to have been in that of Jesus Christ, because here is the boundary line, at which Christianity, Judaism, and Heathenism, at which belief and unbelief separate from each other." "What becomes of the divinity of Jesus Christ, if you do not proclaim, what the tongues of all true Christians ever have confessed, and will confess until the end of the world, that Jesus Christ is the very Son of God, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary?" "We will no longer be Roman Catholics, but we will be Catholics; we will not continue in superstition and human traditions, but we will remain Christians."

Ronge himself went to Berlin for the purpose of healing this division, and a general meeting was held on the 21st of last month (May) at which the Protest-Catholics, as they are now called, proposed the following articles, which had been agreed upon as the basis of a reconciliation:—

1. That Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith.
2. Justification is obtained by faith in Jesus Christ alone.
3. Baptism and the Holy Supper are the only sacraments; but the other five of the Romish Church are pious institutions.
4. The body and blood of Jesus Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper.
5. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to be administered in both kinds.
6. The mass is to be retained as a commemorative celebration (Gedachtnissfeier) of the sacrifice on the cross of Jesus Christ, but in the vulgar tongue.
7. Auricular confession is not to be compulsory.
8. Priests have no absolute power of forgiving sins.
9. Celibacy is not to be compulsory, but is honorable when voluntarily undertaken, if a more efficient discharge of duties requires it.
10. Marriages require a priestly sanction; mixed marriages are lawful.
11. Indulgences and pilgrimages are to be rejected; the saints are to be honored, but not invoked.
12. The purgatory of the Romish Church is to be rejected, but the souls of men undergo purification after death.
13. Christ alone is the Head of His Church; and the Holy Ghost His Vicegerent on earth.
14. "We therefore reject the Pope and his hierarchy, but earnestly desire that the Christian Catholic Church should retain its original constitution, *i. e.* apostolical and episcopal.

While these propositions were being read, loud cries were heard of, "The old thing!" "We want progress!" &c.; and at last the meeting broke up in confusion. The two parties continue separate, and have each their priest.

It only remains to mention that although some of the Protestant sovereigns, and especially the King of Saxony, were at first supposed to look favorably upon the movement, they now barely tolerate, and certainly give it no encouragement. This is doubtless in a great measure owing to the loudly expressed joy of all classes of radicals, and communists, and, as declared by the King of Hanover, the fear that it may in some way or other produce a disturbance of the public peace. They have therefore been refused the right of baptizing and marrying in their own congregations, and are directed to apply to the Protestant clergy for the performance of these rites. In Prussia a royal edict has prohibited the practice of granting to them the use of Protestant churches, although some municipal councils maintain their right of doing so, and that of Dantzig has not only given up to the German Catholics the ancient cathedral of that town, but has even voted an annual stipend to the newly appointed priest out of the public funds. To the King of Prussia we must allow the credit of being actuated by higher motives. He has the penetration to discern that a movement commenced with schism, and carried on by popular excitement, cannot produce the fruits of a healthy and judicious reformation, and, Protestant as he is, would rather see his subjects good Catholics, than unbelievers and rationalists. That the latter must and is intended to be the result, two incidents will clearly prove. The congregation formed at Wismar published, previously to the council at Leipzig, the creed of which they have since accepted as not inconsistent with their own, a separate confession of their faith, in which they expressly deny the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Holy Ghost, and of the Resurrection. The other incident is not less significant. A feast was given at Halle, to celebrate the formation in that town of a German Catholic congregation. Kerbler, until lately a Roman Catholic priest, now chosen to be their minister by the German Catholics at Leipzig, and regarded as, with Ronge and Czerski, one of the leaders of the party, rose to propose a toast. It was the health of Uhlich, the notorious chairman of the association of "Protestant Friends," the Protestant clergyman who in a public assembly avowed that his tenets were unscriptural, who in his published "confessions" has declared, that the association, at the head of which he stands, "seeks to make prevalent a form of Christianity, in which all parties among Protestants, in which Protestants, Catholics, and Greeks, in which Christians and Jews, may feel themselves to agree with one another."

In fine, it is evident that while the Catholic governments openly oppose, the Protestant princes will not support, the new schism. But still it is strong in numbers, strong in popular opinion, strong, above all, in energy and zeal. What the end may be it is impossible to foresee; probably it will share the fate of the "French Catholic Church" projected in 1830, by the Abbé Chatel. In the meanwhile it has, we fear, delayed rather than advanced the prospect of any sound reform in the Roman Catholic Church; and it has undoubtedly given a new impulse to rationalism among the Protestant bodies, and rendered even more vain than before any hope, that they will return to a pure faith, to an apostolical constitution, and to a renewed communion with the Catholic Church of Christ.

---

* We subjoin a faithful, but somewhat rough, translation of the two first and last verses of the song addressed to Ronge:—

I.

Peal the organ's swelling note!
Let the saint's glad voices float,
Like music of the spheres!
To him be praise and honor given,
Who by might of truth hath striven,
Superstition's chains hath riven,—
Us to light from darkness rears!

II.

Thousands tell thy honor'd name,
Tens of thousands greet the same
With accents of pure joy:
Thou the torch of truth didst light,
That through darkness shineth bright;
No human threats, that strove t'affright,
Thy courage could destroy.

* * * * * * * * *

VI.

Thou, like true and valiant knight,
In the van didst choose to fight,
And fear'dst no mortal blow;
We therefore come, thy faithful band,
And here before God's altar stand,
To thank thee, and with heart and hand
Our blessing to bestow.

---

From the Christian Remembrancer.

## Recent Proceedings at Oxford.

(CONCLUDED.)

The Test was no mere prevention of Romanism. The connexion in which it came out appeared to give it simply the Roman application, and to attach it only to Mr. Ward's 'whole cycle of Roman doctrine.' But look at the language of the preamble. It obviously points to other doctrines besides the Roman ones. It does so expressly: it mentions over and above the Roman, another class of doctrines which it describes as doctrines 'which, *hardly or not at all*, oppose the Roman ones'—doctrines, *i. e.* which come near, which border on the Roman—which might popularly be mistaken for the Roman ones—which have features in common with the latter, and have the same element in them. The phrase, '*vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur*,' is significantly vague, and is obviously meant to comprehend a general line of theology, which, though acknowledged not to *be* literally Roman, is considered to be *like* it. It excludes what are called approaches to Roman tenets, as well as those tenets themselves. Here is a passage from the Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff, quoted, by a pamphlet on the side of the Test, on this particular point:—'If, for instance,' says the Bishop, 'in subscribing to the Article which condemns the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, he (the subscriber) mentally reserves the right of holding that doctrine, provided it differ *in some respects* from the Romish, he betrays, according to my judgment, a want of principle, which ought to exclude him, not only from sacred functions, but from every office of important trust.' This is a strong thing to say. On a number of points of doctrine, that of the Real Presence, of Prayer for the Dead, and many others, the Patristic theology says a great deal of what the Roman says, or rather the Roman theology says a great deal of what the Patristic says. The Roman has a strong element in common with it. A mere popular standard would probably put them both together, and see no difference perhaps between them. This is what persons have been saying so long; this is just the view we are so familiar with. Put the high-Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence, or of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and show what they really assert, to the mass of persons, and they will say at once that they are tantamount to Romanism. They will say they do not understand fine distinctions, subtleties, hairbreadth lines; that, if there is a difference, it is not worth speaking of, but that they do not see one: that they take the broad common-sense view, and look at the genuine solid substance of the doctrines, and not at insignificant points. They will say that, if you teach one, you may as well teach the other; and that if the one should not be taught, the other should not be taught either. Do not all of us know, that high doctrine of all kinds has gone simply under the name of 'Popery' with a very large class? that every manifestation which has not bowed to the popular standard, has been set down as such; and that persons have not been able to open their mouths on some subjects, and explain the Church Catechism, without being called 'Romanists?' Such is the real meaning of the language of the Bishop of Llandaff, and of the Oxford Test,—its genuine practical force and bearing. A whole line of theology, that 'differs, in some respects, from the Roman,'—a whole system of teaching, that is '*vix aut ne vix quidem*' separated from the Roman,—that is considered to be the same in principle, and is, as a matter of fact, set down as Romanism, was aimed at in the Test. Is another phrase wanted? The preamble of the Decree on No. XC. gives one quite as symptomatic—a very safe one, indeed, in itself, but very significant in its associations. 'Whereas it is the declared purpose of this University, to maintain and inculcate the pure faith of the Gospel'—who does not know what the '*pure Gospel*' means in popular theology? what such phrases as the 'simplicity of Gospel truth,' and the like, mean? They explain themselves perfectly; they have a regular conventional drift. Do they, or do they not, convey a certain idea of a Gospel system, as opposed to that of a sacramental one, and as specially contrasted to the view which the Church school among us take of the Christian scheme? The 'sense of the University' comes in to crown the whole; the University is first supposed to take a particular line, and to manifest a bias, and then its sense of the Articles is imposed. The whole circumstances of the case, had the University passed that Test, would have shown its animus and real object in so doing; and that would have interpreted the Test.

If any one thinks that we are attributing too large a sweep to the Test, let him reflect for a few moments, and just ask himself what he really thinks would have been the case had the Test passed. Let him put to himself the situation which those who hold the opinions we speak of, would have been in under it; the reflections that they would have been subjected to, if they had not taken it in its broad meaning; the call that would have been made and urged upon them from the quarter that passed it, to retire, to leave a scene where they were marked, and not to struggle with a plain and palpable sentence against them. If any one thinks that we are attributing too large a sweep to the intention of this Test, let him remember the suspension of Dr. Pusey for preaching—what? Roman doctrine? Clearly not: he disclaimed it, *totidem verbis*: for preaching the high Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence; for preaching simply what he demonstrably proved the Fathers of the Church Catholic, and the high divines in our own Church held. That sermon was declared to be 'dissonant with the doctrine of the Established Church,' though it expressly disavowed Roman doctrine. Another field of doctrine then was aimed at in the condemnation of that sermon, besides the Roman: another field of doctrine, besides the Roman, was aimed at in this Test. We are not attributing too large a sweep to the Test.

One word more. This would have been a distinctly new move, a distinct change in our Church's ground. The Test, in condemning this indefinite field of doctrine we speak of, clearly condemned what the Articles do not. The Articles, where they condemn Roman doctrine, plainly condemn that doctrine, and not another; in condemning Roman doctrine, they do not condemn what is not Roman. This Test did. It alluded, under a comprehensive, indefinite phrase, to what it considered *tantamount* to Romanism, as well as to what *was* such. This, whether a right or wrong one, is a *new* theological department to condemn. The Articles do not mention it; it was an addition of the Test's. A distinct addition was made to our Church Tests, to meet the case of the particular opinions that were obnoxious. The Church was prevented from expanding in that direction, and that ground was cut off from her.

Now to this whole view, which unseats minds of the Catholic school from their place in the English Church, whether coming from the Latitudinarian or the Evangelical quarter, or from both, as it does—to this whole view, which regards them as invaders, and prevents them from using and bringing out the Church on its own basis—to that whole view of which the New Test was the expression—the Catholic school has one answer. They see that basis belonging to the Church as a fact. They see a sacramental system and dogmatic creed formally asserted by her—they see a whole fabric, which they accept, and which their opponents do not. So long as they see that, they regard the Church as their own, and not as their opponents.' Take way that ground, alter the Church formularies, and they will take another view of her. But so long as she has these formularies, they feel a right to her, which others have not. They feel that they alone can accept and make real use of her system. Others may develop her on their own basis, but they alone can develop her on hers. They want the liberty to do this if they can—a fair ground, and no favor. They want to exercise the simple natural right of impressing Catholic doctrine upon people's minds by those powers of persuasion, whatever they be, that they are masters of, and of vindicating and unfolding the professed basis of the English Church. Can the other side really use our existing Church system? Do they really take it one bit into account in their religious schemes? Do they not use the Church as a simple shell which covers them, as a mere inclosure, and treat a whole internal system of discipline in her as if it were not? The Ecclesiastical fabric is gutted, and made a case of, and they build up their own theory in the vacuum. But, in the mean time, there the internal system is—it is not cleared away—and a school comes forward, and wants to make use of, and unfold it.

Is it replied, that the system indeed is there formally, but that it is obsolete now? The answer is obvious: it is not obsolete while people wish to make use of it. The claim made supplies its own evidence in this respect. To prevent a system being used because it is obsolete, is very like arguing in a circle. If it can be used, it is not obsolete; and here are those who say they really want to use it. The fact of a large and growing school in the Church that wants to use her system, shows at once that that system has a hold on people's minds, and associates a reality with it. It exists on paper, and that supplies the form—it exists in people's minds, and that gives reality. When a regular movement wants to throw life and vigor into a system, the system has, at any rate, so much solidity and reality as this fact shows.

A Church that has this formal basis, and that has the feeling and spirit of her own sons to carry it out, cannot be interfered with without danger, in the way in which the late efforts have gone. It cannot be monopolized by those who have made the attempt to do so, without a split and a convulsion, that would endanger its very existence as an established institution. A school that feels itself strong in its Church basis, and its own earnestness—that has those numbers, names, consideration, and weight—that has that whole Church strength and footing that this has—is not one to be attacked without great fear and caution, even on the common political and general conservative ground. We trust persons will pause before they continue such a system of aggression. We trust that they will consider the formidable consequences, which must attend the final crush and collision of theological parties now existing in the Church. We hope that, if some are unmindful of these chances and heedless of results, so long as the pursuit is but kept up and victory plays before the eye, others, who occupy a more neutral position, will be more clear-sighted, and see that the Church must suffer. All we wish for is a calm, in which each side may peaceably try each other's strength on the field of sober argument, or moral influence. Let mind and temper, religious feeling, depth, devotion, self-denial, give the superiority, on whichever side it may be; and let the issue be one of natural and gradual transition, and not a rupture or a shock. Let the Catholic movement die way, if it has not spirit enough to sustain itself; if it has, let it cover the ground that it can gain, and occupy the position that it can rise to. At all events, whatever turn the present temper of parties may take, that school occupies a place now from which it will not recede; and it will endeavor, with God's blessing, to carry on that course which it has begun.

---

### New York Gallery of the Fine Arts.

THE Exhibition of the Pictures and Engravings of this Institution is now open to the public, at the Rotunda in the Park, (lately occupied by the Post Office.) Entrance from the Park.

Life Membership One Dollar—to non-members, single admission 25 cents.

The Rooms will be open daily, from 9 A. M. until sundown.

Those holding Scrip Certificates can obtain Certificates of Membership at the door, as heretofore. a9-3tx

---

MISS SELLECK'S Boarding and Day School, corner of Court and Butler sts., Brooklyn, will reopen, Thursday, Sept. 11th, for the reception of pupils. Miss S. particularly requests that those Young Ladies who intend entering her School during the Fall Term should be present, if possible, at the opening of the School. Circulars may be obtained at the residence of the Principal, or of the following gentlemen, to whom, among others, Miss S. has the honor to refer.—Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, LL.D., New York; Revs. S. H. Cox, D.D., J. Spencer, J. Stone, S. T. Spear, Brooklyn. Aug. 16—6t$

---

INSTITUTION OF MESSRS. ABBOTT *for the Education of Young Ladies*, No. 412 Houston st, New York.

The Fall term of this Institution commences Monday, Sept. 15th. The principals devote their time to personal instruction, seeking to secure for their pupils good bodily health, cheerful spirits, the highest intellectual endowments, true refinement of mind and manners and unaffected piety; employing teachers of the highest literary and scientific attainments, in spacious and handsomely furnished parlors, they endeavor to combine the advantages of the gentleness, delicacy, moral purity, and literary taste of a refined home education with that knowledge of the world, easy address and intellectual stimulus, which can only be acquired by associated study. They would give their pupils a perfect education; that with healthy bodies and well disciplined minds and polished manners, and hearts regulated by Christian principle, they may be prepared to enter unembarrassed upon any of the duties of life.

Terms—Pupils under six $6; from six to eight $9; from eight to ten $12; from ten to twelve $15; over twelve $18. The use of all the books required is furnished, and there are no extra charges. A few young ladies can be received into the families of the principals. 6t—Aug. 16

---

EPISCOPAL ACADEMY OF CONNECTICUT. This Institution is under the direction of a Board of Trustees appointed by the Convention of the Diocese, of whom the Bishop is ex-officio President. The Principal is a Presbyter of the Church, and has made arrangements to receive into his family all pupils whom their parents may desire to place more particularly under his charge. It will be his constant aim, and the aim of those associated with him to impart to all intrusted to their care a truly intellectual and religious education.

The Academy is situated in Cheshire, a beautiful, quiet, and healthy village. There are three terms in the year of fourteen weeks each. The first beginning on the first Thursday in Sept., the second on the first Thursday in January, and the third on the fourth Thursday in April.

The charges for tuition are $7 per term for the classics and the higher English studies, and $6 for the lower. Board may be obtained in respectable families for $1 75 per week, exclusive of fuel and washing. Those in the family of the Principal will be charged $50 per term for board, tuition, washing, fuel and lights.

For further particulars apply to the Principal,

Aug. 16—$3t S. B. Paddock, Cheshire, Conn.

---

FRENCH AND ENGLISH SCHOOL.

REV. C. H. WILLIAMSON, Rector of the French Episcopal Church *Du St. Sauveur*, has made such arrangements as will enable him to receive into his family six young ladies, in order to finish their education in the *French* language, of which department he will take the entire charge.

Any young lady, not having completed her studies, either in music, singing, drawing, or any of the English branches, will have the advantage of continuing them in Mrs. Williamson's *Day School*, which has been established for the last eight years.

New York, April 12, 1845, 72 Murray street.

---

EDUCATION.

REV. R. T. HUDDART'S CLASSICAL AND COMMERCIAL BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL—Fourteenth street, between University Place and Fifth Avenue.

This establishment, which has lately been removed from Houston street, is now prepared for the reception of an increased number of Boarders. No expense has been spared to render it a complete, well arranged school for boys. It has been built expressly for the purpose intended, under the direction of one of the first architects in the city, and Mr. Huddart has much satisfaction in presenting to his friends and the public, an institution, in which every requisite for the accommodation, convenience, and comfort of his pupils is combined, and such as the experience of many years has suggested. The situation is perhaps the most eligible which could have been selected for the purpose, as regards health and facility of access. All the advantages of the best instructers and professors are available, whilst the benefits of a country residence are gained by the out-door athletic exercises which can be enjoyed in the spacious play-ground.

Further information as to course of study, and other particulars interesting to parents, may be obtained on application to Mr. Huddart at his residence in Fourteenth street.

N. B.—The regular Academical year will commence on the 1st of September, after the Summer Vacation.

The number of Pupils being limited in the *Day School*, vacancies will be filled as they occur.

For *Boarders* and *Day Boarders* who are entirely distinct and separate, applications will be received at any time.

TERMS—For Boarders, $300 per annum, (without accomplishments,) *Day Boarders*, $50 per quarter; *Day Scholars*, $30 per quarter. June 7—3mis

---

FAMILY SCHOOL FOR BOYS.

*New Hartford, Oneida County, N. Y.*

THE undersigned, having removed to the spacious mansion of the late Judge Sanger at New Hartford, is now prepared to receive into his family a limited number of pupils.

The course of instruction embraces the Classics, Mathematics, and Modern Languages; and will prepare the student for College, or for active business. Vocal and instrumental music will be taught when desired.

The government shall be strictly parental.

The religious instruction of the family is under the general supervision of the Rector of the Parish. The academic year consists of two terms of twenty-two weeks each, commencing on the first day of September and February.

The expense for Tuition in all the branches of study, including Board, Washing, Books, Stationery, Drawing materials, &c. is $175 per annum. Without tuition in Music, Drawing, and the Modern Languages, the charge is $130 per annum.

References.—The Right Rev. W. H. De Lancey, Bishop of the Diocese of Western N. York; the Rev. B. Hale, D. D., President of Geneva College, Geneva; the Rev. J. C. Rudd, D. D., Rev. P. A. Proal, D. D., Rev. George Leeds, Utica; the Rev. Stephen H. Battin, New Hartford; the Rev. Wm. E. Eigenbrodt, New York city; the Rev. John W. Brown, Astoria, L. I.

June 29—yly W. H. PADDOCK.

---

CHURCH, PARLOR AND CHURCH BARREL ORGANS.—The subscriber continues to manufacture the above instruments, of superior quality and at advantageous terms.

He was the first to introduce into this country those admirable and most useful instruments, Church Barrel Organs, which for country churches where organists cannot be procured, are invaluable.

For the last six successive years at the great Fair of the American Institute in this city, he has been awarded the first premiums, viz. Gold and Silver Medals, for the best Organs exhibited.

GEORGE JARDINE,

Aug. 9. 83 Anthony st., next door to Broadway.

---

ORGAN BUILDING.—THOMAS HALL, (formerly of Philadelphia, and more recently of the firm of Hall & Erben,) Church and Parlor Organ Builder, informs his friends and the public, that he is prepared to execute orders for ORGANS of every description, at his Manufactory, No. 86 Wooster street, near Spring, at short notice, and at reduced prices.

From the long experience the subscriber has had in the business of Organ building, he flatters himself he can furnish instruments of a quality at least equal to the productions of any other builders in the United States. Orders for Tuning and Repairing punctually attended to.

THOMAS HALL,
No. 80 and 86 Wooster street,
Dec. 9—yly. near Spring.

---

ORGANS.—The subscriber offers for sale the following Organs, viz:

One of 10 stops, Grecian case, 12 feet 6 inches high, 8 feet 6 inches wide, and 7 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt. One octave of Pedal pipes.

One of 8 stops, 11 feet high, 7 feet 3 inches wide, and 4 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 6 stops, 10 feet 6 inches high, 6 feet 6 inches wide, and 4 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 5 stops, 9 feet 5 inches high, 6 feet wide, and 3 feet 9 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Three of 4 stops, 8 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Six of 3 stops, 7 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 4 inches wide, and 2 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Also two elegant parlor organs, in Mahogany polished cases.

Also a dumb organ. This is a piece of Machinery that can be attached to, or removed from, the keys of any organ without difficulty. They are operated on by a Crank, similar to a Barrel Organ, and can be made to play any music required.

HENRY ERBEN,

Sept. 7. Centre street, head of Canal st.

---

TRINITY CHURCH CEMETERY, near Manhattanville, being now fenced in the most permanent and secure manner, with a keeper constantly on the grounds, is open for the interment of the dead of all denominations, in single graves or church vaults. A large proportion of the grounds has been laid out in private burial and vault lots, which are all fronted on avenues. A choice of which can now be made by persons wishing to secure them. The prices for the same, as well as for single interments, have been fixed very low. Undertakers or Sextons of any Church, can procure permits for interments, by applying to J. Morrison, at the Vestry office, corner of Fulton and Church streets, from 9 A. M., to 3 P. M., and after that hour at 17 Clarkson street. The use of the chapel and receiving tomb, in Clarkson street, will be granted, if desired, without any charge except the Sexton's, for opening, which is $1.

The soil is very dry and light, and is particularly well suited for burial purposes. A large room in the keeper's lodge is fitted up and warmed for the use of persons useing or visiting the Cemetery. The Manhattanville line of stages leaves the corner of Chatham street and Tryon Row (Hall of Records) every hour, and conveys passengers to or from the Cemetery for 18 3-4 cts each. It is expected that steamboats will land passengers or funerals at the Cemetery pier the ensuing season twice a day, fare 12½ cts. Information as to the price of Burial Plots, &c., can be had at the Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church streets, or at No. 261 Broadway, corner of Warren street.

November 9—tf

---

THE subscribers have just received from London a valuable addition to their stock of Theological works, among which are—

Bishop Gibsons Codex Juris Ecclesiastici, 2 vols. folio, $12; whole works of Bishop Reynolds, folio, $9; Hughes's Divines of the Church of England, 22 vols. 8vo. $36; Scholar Armed, 2 vols. very rare, $7; Father Simon's Critical History, 2 vols. 4to, $4; Trials of the Seven Bishops, Laud, &c. folio, $3 50; Newman's Scripture Concordance, folio, $3; Stackhouse's Body of Divinity, 3 copies folio, $6; do, on the Creed, 2 copies folio, $3 50; Mendam's History of the Council of Trent and other works, 3 vols. $9; Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge, 2 vols. $4 50; Stillingfleet's various works, separate vols; Sherlock's Works, Hughes's edition, 5 vols. 6 copies, $7—his works also separate; Beddulps's various works; Wogan on the Lessons, 4 vols, $5; Faber on the Trinity, 2 vols. 3 copies, $4 50; Jebb's Theology, $5; Bishop Sumner's whole expository works, 10 vols. splendid calf gilt, $18; Burton's Sermons, do, do, $4; Kennett's Works, 5 vols. $5; L'Estrange and various other works on the Liturgy.

STANFORD & SWORDS.

S. & S. have in press, and will publish about September, a full Catalogue of their Theological works, which will be sent gratis to any who may desire it.

Aug. 23.

---

JAMES A. SPARKS,
No. 161 Fulton street, New York.

BEGS leave to offer his services to Clergymen and others at a distance from the New York Book Market, to purchase books for them on the most reasonable terms, and to forward them as may be directed, to any part of the United States, or Canada.

Orders, enclosing cash, for any book in this market, or for Sunday School Libraries, will be promptly attended to.

J. A. S. would refer to the Right Rev. the Bishop of New York; the Right Rev. Bishop Chase, of Illinois, the Rev. Messrs. D. S. Lewis, St. Francisville, La.; W. D. Cairns, Columbus, Ga.; J. A. M'Kenney, Cambridge, Md.; Rev. John Coleman, D. D., Editor of the Banner of the Cross, Philadelphia; Rev. Wm. Henry Hoit, St. Albans, Vermont; Rev. M. P. Parks, Chaplain of the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; J. S. F. Heald, Esq., Darien, Ga.; Rev. J. Singetary, Washington, N. C.; B. W. Fosdick, Esq., Savannah, Georgia.

J. A. S. is Agent for the following Church Works: The Banner of the Cross, weekly, price $2 50 in advance. The True Catholic, monthly, price $2 50 in advance. A View of the Organization and Orders of the Primitive Church, by Rev. A. B. Chapin, A.M., price $1 50.

---

### Church Cushions, Pulpit Furniture, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfully inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making of Furniture for and Trimming of Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,

Aug. 3—tf No. 52 Maiden Lane.

---

CHURCH BOOKS published by the subscriber, may be had of the following persons:

G. G. Smith, St. Albans, Vt.; C. Stimpson, Boston, Mass.; H. S. Parsons, Hartford, Ct.; Croswell & Jewett, New Haven, Ct.; Dr. S. Lockwood, Stamford, Ct.; Young & Hartt, Troy, N. Y.; E. H. Pease, Albany, N. Y.; W. C. Little, Albany, N. Y.; W. R. & C. E. Peck, Buffalo, N. Y.; J Tiffany, Utica, N. Y.; Arnold & Grubb, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; George & Wayne, Philadelphia, Penn.; H. Hooker, Philadelphia, Penn.; H. Colburn, Baltimore, Md.; Joseph Gill, Richmond, Va.; A. E. Miller, Charleston, S. C.

J. A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore, 161 Fulton st.,
opposite St. Paul's.

---

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

NOW published The Doctrine of the Cross, being 'a memorial of an humble follower of Christ,' Rector of St. James's Church, New York. with an introduction by the Rev. John Dowdney, A.M.

The above little work, which has been highly recommended by the *British Critic*, *The Churchman*, *Banner of the Cross*, *Gospel Messenger*, &c., is now published and for sale, price 50 cents, by

H. M. ONDERDONK & CO.

June 28—tf. 25 John st.

---

TO CLERGYMEN, PROFESSIONAL GENTLEMEN, and others,

The subscriber having removed his Bindery to 140 Fulton street, would respectfully offer his services to all persons having Libraries, and Books to rebind and arrange, and can confidently assure them that from many years experience in the business, they cannot fail to be suited. Books bound after any pattern, libraries repaired, &c. &c. All work done will be warranted. Gentlemen will be waited upon at their residence by addressing a note to the subscriber, or leaving it at this office.

ASA L. SHIPMAN,

May 31—tf 140 Fulton street.

---

Just Published

### By the General Prot. Episcopal S. S. Union,

Daniel Dana, Jr., Agent,

THE JUVENILE REPOSITORY, Vol. IV., being a republication of a portion of Burns' (London) Juvenile Series.

Daily Exercise of Prayer, Morning and Evening, neatly printed on a card.

For sale at the Depository, 20 John st. May 17—tf

---

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository, No. 20 John street, New York.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Union Primer,.................... | per hundred | $3 00 |
| Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1, | " | 1 38 |
| " " " No. 2, | " | 1 75 |
| " " " No. 3, | " | 2 00 |
| " " " No. 4, | " | 5 00 |
| Questions on the Sunday School Books, | " | 5 00 |
| Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,) | " | 1 38 |
| Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)........ | " | 2 50 |
| Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,......... | " | 10 00 |
| Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, | " | 5 00 |
| Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,.............................. | " | 3 00 |
| Church Catechism,.................... | " | 1 25 |
| First Truths,.............................. | " | 2 50 |
| Duty to God,.............................. | " | 0 50 |
| Church Primer,.......................... | " | 1 38 |
| Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers.................. | " | 10 00 |
| Manual of Short Prayers for Children... | " | 1 75 |
| Harmony of the Creeds ....... ....... | " | 2 25 |
| Questions on the Book of Common Prayer, | " | 2 25 |
| Collects from the Prayer Book.......... | " | 2 00 |
| Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,... | " | 10 00 |
| Catechism on the Collects.................. | " | 25 00 |
| Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book, | " | 8 00 |
| Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers............ | " | 10 00 |
| Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament, | " | 20 00 |
| " " Vol. 2, New " | " | 22 00 |
| Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers, | " | 10 00 |
| " " 2, " | " | 9 00 |
| " " 3, " | " | 10 00 |
| Questions on The Acts, 1, " | " | 10 00 |
| " " 2, " | " | 9 00 |
| " " 3, " | " | 8 00 |
| Easy Questions for a Little Child, | " | 2 50 |
| Beavens' Help to Catechising..... | " | 10 00 |

☞ A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars. —Library Books.—

The Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Library, 81 vols. 18mo.—reduced price to poor schools, $12.

The same, bound in 151 volumes of various prices. Total, $21 83 nett.

The Children's Magazine, bound in 32 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $6 63 nett.

The Juvenile Library, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

☞ Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to DANIEL DANA, Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John street.

New York, April 6, 1844.

---

## Agents for the Churchman.

Portsmouth, N H—Rev Charles Burroughs, D. D and George M Marsh.
Burlington, Vt—N A Tucker, Esq.
Middlebury, Vt—Harmon A Sheldon.
Boston, Mass—Charles Stimpson.
Pawtucket, R I—David Le Favour.
St Albans, Vt—G G Smith.
New Haven, Ct—Croswell & Jewett, booksellers.
Hartford, Ct—Henry S Parsons.
Philadelphia, Pa—George & Wayne, bookseller.
Albany, N Y—W C Little, Esq., bookseller.
Catskill, N Y—Charles B Pinckney.
Schenectady, N Y—A A Van Voorst.
Troy, N Y—Young & Hartt.
West Troy, N Y—George H Lewis.
Lansingburgh, N Y—Alex. Walsh, Esq. (gratis.)
Poughkeepsie, N Y—Ebenezer C Arnold.
Hudson, N Y—Milo B. Root.
Newburgh, N Y—William Purdy.
Auburn, N Y—Thomas C Miller.
Geneva, N Y—R S Doolittle.
Utica, N Y—Isaiah Tiffany.
Watertown, N Y—J F Hutchinson, Esq., P. M.
Unadilla, N Y—A B Watson.
Oswego, N Y—Henry Adriance.
Buffalo, N Y—W B & C E Peck, booksellers.
Fayetteville, N Y—D L Farnham, Esq.
Newcastle, Delaware—Hon. James Booth.
Baltimore, Md—H Colburn.
Chaptico, Md—J Biscoe, Post Office.
Princess Ann, Md—Wm W Johnston, Esq., P. M.
Alexandria, D C—Bell & Entwistle.
Norfolk, Va—George Rowland, Esq.
Richmond, Va—Joseph Gill.
Wilmington, N C—A A Brown, Esq.
Charleston, S C—A E Miller.
Augusta, Georgia—G McLaughlin.
Louisville, Ky—Solomon K Grant.
Lexington, Ky—William Iucho.
Marietta, Ohio—Arius Nye.
Cleveland, Ohio—Lewis Handerson.
Quincy, Illinois—Henry H Hoffman, Post Office]
Chicago, Illinois—John H Kenzie, Esq.
Jackson, Michigan—P E Demill, Esq.
Homer, Michigan—Rev E O Hodgkin.
St. Louis, Missouri—R P Williams.
Natchez, Miss—Brevoort Butler.
Mobile, Ala.—S. W. Raymond, and J. M. Conley.
Halifax, N S—Joseph H Graham, bookseller.